Labour Monthly

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

WORLD ALLIANCE IN ACTION

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

Notes of the Month

World Alliance in Action by R.P.D.

and Articles by

QUÆSTOR

W. GALLACHER, M.P.

R. PAGE ARNOT

ALLEN HUTT

B. FARRINGTON

HARRY POLLITT

and

Book Review by

MULK RAJ ANAND

JULY 1942 VOL. 24 No. 7

6D

Editorial and Publishing Offices: 134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3 Telephone: FIN. 5135

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BUILD THE GROUPS

Now, in the long evenings of double summer time, readers have an exceptional opportunity to gather together for discussion. Keen discussion and interchange of opinion within the Discussion Groups helps everyone; and strengthens everyone for effective action within the workshop, at the branch and in every form of political life. More groups! More members! More meetings!

LABOUR MONTHLY DISCUSSION GROUPS

(Places in **BOLD TYPE** are new Groups. Places in *italics* are projected Groups)
(Please send STAMPED ADDRESSED ENVELOPE for particulars)

LONDON AREA

Acton, Beckenham, Bethnal Green, **BURNT OAK**, *Chelsea*, Chiswick, Clapton, East Ham, Edgware, Edmonton, Enfield, Finchley, Forest Gate, Fulham, Golders Green, Greenwich, Hampstead, Hampstead Garden Suburb, Hanwell, **HARRINGAY**, Highgate, Holborn, Lambeth, Leyton, Marylebone, Morden, North Kensington, Palmers Green, Putney, **SOUTHFIELDS**, South Kensington, Walthamstow, Wandsworth, Wembley, Westminster, Willesden, Winchmore Hill.

HOME COUNTIES

Addington, Amersham, **ASHFORD** (Kent), Ashtead, **ASSINGTON** (near Colchester), Banstead, Beaconsfield, Bishops Stortford, Braintree, Brentwood, Bromley, Buckhurst Hill, Bushey, Bush Hill Park, Canterbury, Caterham, *Cheam*, Chelmsford, Chingford, Claygate and Esher, **CROWTHORNE**, Croxley Green, *Croydon*, Didcot, Dunstable, Epsom, Gerrards Cross, Goring-on-Thames, Gravesend, Grays, **GREENFORD**, Guildford, **HADLEIGH**, **HAROLD WOOD**, Harpenden, Harrow, Hatfield, Hayes (Middlesex), Hemel Hempstead, Hertford, Hillingdon, Hitchin, Hornchurch, Ilford, Kenton, Letchworth, Maidenhead, North Harrow and Rayners Lane, Orpington, Pinner, **PITSEA**, **PLUCKLEY**, Princes Risborough, **RADLETT**, Ruislip, St. Albans, *Sevenoaks*, *Shepperton*, Slough, *Staines*, Sunbury-on-Thames, Twickenham, Upminster, Wallingford, Wallington, Waltham Cross Watford, Welling, Welwyn, Windsor and Eton, Woodford.

PROVINCES

Abercynon, Aberdeen, Abertillery, Aldershot, Alfreton and Ripley, Altrincham, Andover, Ayr, Bacup, **BANBURY**, Barnstaple, Basingstoke, Bath, Batley, **BEAUMARIS**, Biddulph, Birkenhead, Birmingham, Blackpool, **BOGNOR REGIS**, **BOSTON**, Bournemouth, Bridgend, Bristol, Buckhaven, **CAITHNESS**, Cambridge, Canterbury, Cardiff, Cardigan, Carlisle, Castle Douglas **CASTLEFORD**, Cheadle, Cheltenham, Chester, Chippenham, **CHORLEY**, Cirencester, Clevedon **COCKERMOUTH**, *Coventry*, Cwmllynfell, Dartmouth, **DARTON**, **DAWLEY BANK**, Derby **DONCASTER**, East Grinstead, Edinburgh, Exeter, Farnborough (Hants), Farnham, Fawley *Folkestone*, Glasgow, Gloucester, Grantham, Greenock, Guiseley, Halifax, Heanor, Hebburn, Hereford Horsham, **HUYTON**, Hyde, *Inverurie*, **JARROW**, Kendal, Kidderminster, **LEEDS**, **LEICESTER** **LEMINGTON-ON-TYNE**, Leyland, Liverpool, Llanelly, *Llangollen*, **LOWESTOFT**, Macclesfield Maidstone, Maldon (Essex), Manchester, Mansfield, Marple, Merseyside, Middlesbrough, Milngavie Minehead, **MOSS PARK** (Glasgow), Nantwich, Neath, Nelson, Netley, Newark, Newcastle-on-Tyne Newcastle (Staffs), New Mills, Newtown, *North Kelsey*, Northallerton, **NORWICH**, Nuneaton Paisley, Penrith, **PETERSFIELD**, Plympton, Portchester, **PORTSMOUTH**, Preston, Rawtenstall Reading, Renton, Rhondda, Rugby, *Rushden*, Ryton, St. Helens, *Saffron Walden*, Salisbury, Saltcoat Scunthorpe, Sedgley, Shrewsbury, Skipton, Somerton, Speke, Stafford, Stockport, Stoke-on-Trent *Stornoway*, Stroud, Sunderland, Swindon, Talgarth, *Taunton*, Tonypandy, Tonyrefail, Tunbridge Wells Walsall, Wareham, Warrington, Warwick, Wednesbury, Westbury, Weston-super-Mare, Whitstable Winchester, Wolverhampton, Woodbridge, Worcester, Worksop, Worthing, Wrexham, Yarmouth Yeadon, Yeovil.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

Anglo-Soviet Treaty and Second Front—No Time to Lose—Landmark of World History —A Twenty-First Anniversary—Twenty-Five Years of Anglo-Soviet Relations— Truth Conquers the Calumnies—British Policy Turning Point—A Long-Term Perspective—Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States—Progressive Possibilities—Political Pre-conditions—Munichites Still Fighting— Friends and Enemies—Labour Party Conference—Electoral Truce—Communist Party Conference—New Responsibilities.

THE cause of world unity against Fascism has made a giant advance in the past month. The announcement on June 11 of the British-Soviet Treaty of Alliance, signed on May 26, confirming and deepening the Pact of a year ago, and extending its significance to a long-term perspective of co-operation of the two Powers in the organisation of world peace for a whole generation ahead; the parallel close understanding reached in the Soviet-American negotiations at the beginning of June ; and the simultaneous announcement on behalf of the Governments of Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union that " full understanding " has been reached with regard to " the urgent tasks of creating a Second Front in Europe in 1942 "—these constitute a landmark of world history which will profoundly influence the outcome of the present war and the whole future course of world politics and of the modern era. Opportunities have been opened which will be received with deep and heartfelt welcome by the peoples of the entire world, and which must now be made the signal for action.

ALL future questions and tasks need now to be reviewed in the light of these agreements. At the heart of the present understandings reached is the practical understanding for combined military action in 1942, the fulfilment of which will govern the realisation of all the further aims. This declaration of unity of strategy and undertaking for action in 1942 is the hard core of the agreements reached. After a long, chequered and controversial background during these past twelve months, the objective of " the Second Front in Europe in 1942 " has received official recognition, and becomes thereby the declared policy of the Government, the nation and of all parties and organisations supporting the Government and the war effort. This is a great step forward, and the very delay in reaching it makes the urgency in translating it into action the greater. By this undertaking the basis has been laid for establishing the full combined strategy and action of the United Nations during the second half of this critical year of the supreme battle against Fascism. From the moment of this decision the old controversy on this issue belongs to the past. Only the practical problems and tasks for the speedy, effective and united fulfilment of this undertaking must now concentrate all our attention and engage our entire effort.

THERE is no time to be lost in translating into action the agreements reached. We are entering the second year since the establishment of British-

Vol. XXIV. No. 7 CONTENTS FOR JULY July, 1942

		Page
Notes of the Month— *World Alliance in Action*	*by* R. P. D.	193
The Anglo-Soviet Treaty	*by* QUAESTOR	202
The Labour Party Conference	*by* WILLIAM GALLACHER, M.P.	206
The Dark Forces	*by* R. PAGE ARNOT	208
Organisers of Victory	*by* ALLEN HUTT	213
The Daily Worker	*by* PROFESSOR FARRINGTON	217
" Britain in the World Front "	*by* HARRY POLLITT	220
Document of the Month— Text of Treaty of May 26		222
Review	*by* MULK RAJ ANAND	223

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet unity. We are entering the seventh month of the decisive year 1942. The widespread sense of growing hope and confidence engendered by the strengthened unity of the alliance and by its increased striking power, with the consequent expectation of combined offensive action, must not blind us to the gravity of the present war situation : the formidable military and mechanical power of Nazism hurling at this moment the main mass of its forces and of the forces of its satellites against the Soviet armies at Kharkov, Sebastopol or Leningrad ; advance of the Nazi offensive towards Egypt ; Japanese pressure on China and daily closer threat to India, with the deteriorating political situation in India ; the landing on the Aleutian Islands ; and the evident seriousness of the shipping position. The confidence that can to-day be justly felt leaves no room for easy-going optimism ; and any illusions that a diplomatic agreement is equivalent to military victory need to be quickly replaced by the stern recognition that the conversations at London and Washington are the prelude to heavy conflicts and the most intense phase of the war. The advocates of the Second Front in Europe have never hidden the truth that the path of the Second Front is a rough and thorny path, which will call for heavy sacrifices and the utmost determination ; but it is the sure and necessary path to victory, with the minimum final cost.

WE have spent heavily that expensive commodity, time, during these twelve months since June, 1941. The decision in principle for combined action has still to overcome the many obstacles of practice, rendered in some respects the more considerable and arduous by the length of warning given to Hitler to prepare, and by the fact that the prolonged preceding division of policy and the consequent inevitably necessary political fight has resulted in the peculiar situation that a strategic decision has had to be reached and announced beforehand in a public diplomatic document. For these disadvantages in entering on the Second Front, which will make the cost greater, we have to thank the Halifaxes, the Kemsleys, the military die-hards and all those reactionaries who by their resistance retarded the necessary decision. We must make up for these disadvantages by our response now. The decision in principle for the necessity of the establishment of the Second Front in Europe this year has at last been reached. But its speedy execution in time to affect the battles now opening will require every ounce of united effort. The practical tasks of preparation—military, political and economic, in respect of shipping, use of shipping and extension of shipbuilding, mobilisation of man-power and woman-power, maximum utilisation of all our resources, strengthening of leadership and strengthening of national unity—stand in the forefront of urgency.

THE immediate urgency of these practical tasks prevents more than rapid attention being given to the wider significance of the Treaty which has now been signed between Britain and the Soviet Union. And yet the magnitude of the change and new alignment which is embodied in this Treaty is so great, its bearing on the whole future so profound, and its consequent significance as the setting and framework of the present struggle so far-reaching, that the understanding of this change and of the new long-term course to which the destinies of the British people are now committed is an essential part of political preparedness for the present struggle. Twenty years is a long time in the lifetime of those now living ; it is a considerable time in the rapid tempo of modern development ; and in this era of transition from the old order to the new it gives time for much to happen which, if we play our part, can

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now happen under more favourable conditions for the advance of the cause of human liberation, both for the people of this country and for the peoples of the world, thanks to this Treaty.

IT so happens that this month's issue of the LABOUR MONTHLY is the twenty-first anniversary issue of our journal since its foundation in July, 1921. We can be happy and proud that the twenty-first anniversary of our journal should coincide with so signal an advance of principles for which it has consistently fought, principles of closer international co-operation and especially of the friendship and unity of the British and Soviet peoples. When our first number appeared, the civil wars promoted by foreign interventionists against the young Socialist Republic had not yet reached their conclusion; but the main victory had already been won by the fighting heroism of the Soviet people against immeasurable odds, and by the international solidarity of the working people of all countries, including the splendid role of the Councils of Action of the British working-class movement which laid the foundations of British-Soviet friendship and dealt a blow to the war-plots of the reactionary anti-Soviet interventionists, forerunners of the modern Munichites.

THERE followed the long chapter of chequered Anglo-Soviet relations during these twenty years, whose antagonistic course has been the index of the world situation. Reaction and economic decay at home; refusal of working-class unity; the growth of Fascism in Europe; support of reaction abroad and hostility to the Soviet Union: these were the characteristics of these inter-war years of disastrous memory in the history of this country, the years of the Baldwins and MacDonalds and Chamberlains. Through all these years the reactionaries in control of affairs in this country continued to pursue their hostility to the Soviet Union with the same implacable and tenacious hatred which a century and a half ago their forerunners had meted out to the French Revolution and its influence throughout the world. Through all these years the Anglo-Soviet antagonism continued the pivot of world politics; and its consequences wrought immeasurable harm for both the British and the Russian peoples, as for the whole world situation, culminating in the present war.

ON the basis of the Anglo-Soviet antagonism German Fascism climbed to power in the international arena, and was able to advance from an originally disarmed condition to renew the world menace of German militarism which had been seemingly crushed at the cost of ten million lives twenty years before. On the basis of the Anglo-Soviet antagonism in the international arena, and on the basis of the division of the working class in Germany, Fascism originally climbed to power within Germany. On the basis of the Anglo-Soviet antagonism, dangling before the gaze of the besotted Munichites the glittering prospectus of the grand crusade against the Soviet Union to cover their designs against the British Empire and against the freedom of every independent nation in the world, Fascism penetrated the inmost citadels and commanding circles of every leading country outside the Soviet Union (where its agents were promptly ferreted out and handed over to stern justice); built up its armed strength to create the most formidable and ruthless military machine yet known in the records of any conquering empire; domineered over international politics; extended its rule of oppression and barbarism and swept forward with seemingly resistless advance, until it was able to threaten both the Soviet Union and the peoples of the West.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IT is to-day universally recognised that if the Anglo-Soviet Alliance, which was originally first proposed by the Communist Party of Great Britain in the spring of 1935, had been adopted earlier, it could have prevented the present war. It is to-day universally recognised—as the recent publication in this country of the book of the former American Ambassador to Moscow, Joseph E. Davies, has emphasised—that the Soviet Union correctly estimated the world menace of Nazism and its aggression from the day that Hitler came to power; correctly estimated the measures necessary to combat it, which could have won success had not the Munichite policies in control in Britain and France prevented the fulfilment of those measures and compelled the temporary alternative weapon of the Non-Aggression Pact to defeat Munichism; correctly prepared and carried through the serious and heavy rearmament from 1933 onwards which is to-day bearing the brunt and saving the world from Fascism; correctly diagnosed and liquidated the Fifth Column long before its nature was understood by the Western world, in those trials which at the time won the uncomprehending abuse and denunciation, in place of the gratitude, of Western publicists; and correctly carried through those strategic measures in 1939–41 which broke the weight of the Nazi offensive in 1941 and helped to prevent the capture of Leningrad and Moscow in the autumn of that year. It is to-day universally recognised that the Munichite policies were fatal and a betrayal of the interests of the British people, and that, had their culmination in the Finland adventure and planned armed expedition for war in support of Mannerheim against the Soviet Union in 1940 reached fruition, it would have meant war in support of Fascism against the main antagonist of Fascism, opening the way to the world victory of Fascism and the destruction of the independence of the British people.

YET every one of these issues required at the time a severe and arduous against-the-stream fight on the part of the left to spread understanding, in the face of the deluge of reactionary calumny, prejudice and ignorance. To-day every one of these issues, which were at the time so controversial, is already becoming the commonplace of the historian, so that younger people will soon be wondering how on earth their predecessors could have gone astray on such obvious issues. The wheel has come full circle. The Anglo-Soviet Alliance, which was previously rejected, is now universally acclaimed; while the remaining cliques of Munichite and pro-Fascist reactionaries who from their holes and corners still seek to denigrate the Soviet Union and weaken Anglo-Soviet unity are now becoming recognised as traitors and enemies to their own nation, the counterpart of the Quislings and Fifth Column of all countries. The united action of Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States is now becoming recognised as constituting the indispensable basis, the main pillar and bastion, not only for the alliance in the cause of freedom against Fascism and for the immediate defeat of Fascism, but for the future organisation of world peace and world collaboration. With this the perspective of a new era in world politics comes in view.

FOR British policy the change of alignment represented by the Treaty is far reaching; and we can pay tribute to the bold realism of those Conservative leaders, represented by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden, who could thus plainly recognise the realities of power in the modern world situation, irrespective of political colour, and draw the practical conclusions, in place of pursuing the self-destructive follies of the old Munichite policies. The *Daily Telegraph* has described this alliance as an alliance without precedent:—

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Swedish comment that Britain has become a European Power in the widest sense does not fully express the break with precedent. British interests were as widely European as they could be in the later years of Louix XIV, at the Congress of Vienna in 1815, or at Versailles in 1919.

It may seem to neutral opinion that in the past Britain only entered European affairs to join a coalition of weak Powers against a Roi Soleil or a Napoleon aiming at the domination of the Continent, and that the change now is the formation of an alliance of the strongest Powers. In fact, the divergence from precedent is much greater, and the new policy of another scale and scope from any we have followed hitherto. Before now we have formed alliances with great empires for the defeat of aggression, agreeing to make no separate peace. The distinction of this alliance is that it will not terminate on the signing of a peace treaty. Throughout our history British policy has avoided committing itself to long-term responsibility for the affairs of Europe. Neither the statesmen of Vienna nor the statesmen of Versailles linked Britain, by bond of individual action, with "the organisation of security and economic prosperity" in Europe.

We have pledged ourselves with Russia to an enterprise never before attempted. (*Daily Telegraph*, June 13, 1942.)

THE change is the reflection of the changed position of Britain in the world. Isolation died with the ending of the old nineteenth-century world monopoly and secure world-dominant position. The Anglo-German antagonism which dominated the first two decades of the twentieth century was met by the building of a temporary war coalition of the old type which fell apart after victory. Thereafter a period of confusion followed. The initial attempt at a new form of organisation through the League of Nations failed, since the League of Nations was in fact no international organisation, but in the first stage a league of victors, from which the strongest victor, the United States, broke away, so that it became an Anglo-French organ; while in the later stage when, with the entry of the Soviet Union, it began to show signs of functioning in an international fashion and serving as an international rallying ground against Fascist aggression, the Anglo-French Munichite reaction turned against it and broke it up. The apparent completeness of the victory of 1918 concealed the real weakness of Britain thereafter; hence for a time the old illusions of self-sufficiency and world isolationism survived in a tattered parody in the Munich policy. Munichism completely failed to recognise the changed relations of world power, despised and condemned collective security (which offered the best chance of survival for the weakened Britain), and still sought to dictate to all the countries of the world, to direct and control Nazi Germany, to hold aloof from the United States, to isolate and destroy the Soviet Union, and ended by isolating Britain before a powerful Nazi Germany dominating the European Continent.

EXPERIENCE thus drove home the necessity of an alternative policy and a basic new alignment for Britain within a long-term alliance or wider system. For a time the attempt was made to find a solution by building on co-operation with the United States; and the conception of an exclusive Anglo-American domination, or domination of "the Anglo-Saxon world" (in Lord Halifax's expression), found favour, and still finds favour with a certain circle. But it soon became clear that such an exclusive partnership meant inevitably the increasing subordination of the weaker British partner to the more powerful American partner. France had collapsed. The only alternative within the traditional circle of relationships, the Munichite alternative of alliance with Nazi Germany, now meant complete surrender and subordination to Nazi world domination. In this situation the possibility of long-term co-operation with the Soviet Union, alongside and balancing co-operation with the United States, became more and more clearly revealed, no longer as some supposed panacea of the left, but as the rock of salvation from the standpoint of Conservative statesmanship.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE tripartite collaboration of Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States, the three main centres of world power after the downfall of Fascism, becomes the indispensable basis for the organisation of world peace and security, which is indispensable for the weakened power of Britain after the war. Hence the conception of Britain's pivotal role of co-operation with the Soviet Union, on the one hand, and with the United States, on the other, becomes the key to the present dominant British policy. But the interest of the United States in Europe, still the central battleground of world political problems, is necessarily more limited than that of Britain and the Soviet Union. Hence the co-operation of Britain and the Soviet Union is necessarily drawn especially close. This finds expression in the twenty-year alliance of Britain and the Soviet Union, pending the organisation of a world system of security. Thus the interests of progressive democratic politics here coincide with the enlightened calculations of self-interest of ruling-class politics or Conservative statesmanship in the present British-Soviet alignment. This is what gives the hope of greater strength and stability to the alliance.

BUT this alignment, which thus follows, not from sentiment (although deeply corresponding to the feelings of the peoples of both countries), but from a solid identity of interest, comprehensible to more far-seeing representatives of the ruling class in Britain on the basis of a normal calculation of ruling-class politics or power-politics, carries with it important social and political consequences. For if we have here, not merely a temporary war collaboration, but a serious and long-term international co-operation for a whole epoch ahead, then this affects the entire world situation and the position of Britain in the world situation. It would mean that Britain is ranged for a whole epoch of development with the progressive forces of the world. It would mean that for the first time for a century and a half the role of Britain as the rock of world counter-revolution comes to an end and passes out of the historical record. It would mean that the most favourable conditions are created for rapid progressive social and political development within Britain.

IT cannot yet be said that such a perspective is certain, since this depends on the maintenance of a combination of political forces within Britain favourable to upholding, carrying forward and sincerely fulfilling the alliance. The disintegration of political stability in Britain and emergence of violent Fascist, counter-revolutionary or Munichite anti-Soviet forces to a dominant position would at once change the whole perspective. No paper document, but only the united will, political consciousness and active role of the people, and especially of the labour movement, can guarantee the outcome. There are still plenty of dangers in front. We have first to win the war against Fascism. We have to ensure that the Munichite and anti-Soviet plotters do not succeed in their aims of disrupting national unity during the war in order to destroy the present basis of the alliance and prepare the way for alternative policies. We have to ensure that the labour movement or sections of the labour movement do not become the instrument of the Munichites for disrupting national unity, but that the labour movement plays the foremost role in maintaining the widest co-operation in action on the basis of the alliance and for the fulfilment of the Second Front. Given the realisation of these conditions in the present critical moment of supreme struggle, whose outcome will determine the future, very great opportunities open out for progressive advance in the whole future period on the basis of the extending collaboration of the progressive peoples of the world.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BUT it would be a profound error to underestimate the still continuing strength and activity of the Munichite pro-Fascist and anti-Soviet forces. They have received a heavy blow with the present alliance and the measure of agreement reached on the question of the Second Front in Europe. But they have not acknowledged defeat. The speech of the Secretary of the Conservative 1922 Committee, Captain J. E. Crowder, M.P., on June 13, two days *after* the announcement of the Treaty and of the full understanding with regard to the urgency of the Second Front in Europe in 1942, was equivalent to a declaration of continued hostilities. After attacking the "one-sided character" of the "so-called political truce," and denouncing the "popular agitation for a Second Front," Captain Crowder went on to say (according to the *Evening Standard* report) :—

> Europe was not for us—as it was for Germany—the truly supreme stake in all issues. I find it very difficult to agree that Allied intervention on the Continent at this stage, on a large scale, could turn the tide in the East.

Thus the Munichites are continuing the fight, irrespective of the governmental agreement. The political issue is not finished. While the practical tasks of the Second Front must, from the moment of the present agreement, receive first and main attention, it is necessary to continue the campaign, now on the broadest scale of national unity and a nationally agreed policy, to mobilise opinion in support of and in preparedness for the speediest establishment of the Second Front in Europe in 1942, and to combat, expose and demand appropriate measures against the Munichite opposition. National unity is now more than ever essential as the indispensable basis for the successful establishment and maintenance of the Second Front.

IT is here that considerable sections of opinion in the labour movement, influenced by impatience with the continued dominance of Conservative policy in home questions, and consequently turning at this moment to declare opposition to the whole basis of national unity against Fascism, to denounce the electoral truce (in exactly the same way as the Secretary of the 1922 Committee), and to demand the withdrawal of Labour from the Government and the bringing down of the Government, completely fail to see the real political situation, the real fight which has to be fought, or the hostile forces which their manoeuvres would assist. So long as Fascism has still to be defeated in the present military conflict, so long as this is the main menace confronting the working-class movement and the people, all who stand for victory over Fascism must stand united, as the necessary condition of victory. The enemy is not those sections of the ruling class who stand most firmly for the fight to the end against Fascism, who have played a foremost part in building up the united alliance, who have just signed a Twenty Years' Treaty with the Soviet Union, and who have concluded the agreement with regard to the Second Front in Europe in 1942. The political enemy to be fought is those sections of the ruling class, the Munichites, and their variegated types of spokesmen and publicists, who seek to weaken the fight against Fascism, to sabotage Anglo-Soviet unity and slander the Soviet Union, to disrupt national unity and to oppose the Second Front.

THE lesson of the Labour Party Conference emphasises the dangers of confusion on this question. The Labour Party Conference revealed many important positive features. It revealed the growth of militancy and desire for an active policy among the delegates, and readiness to reach a judgment independent of the Executive in pursuit of this aim. The majority for lifting the ban on the *Daily Worker*, carried against the Executive and in spite of the block votes of the two general unions registered

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against it, was a signal progressive victory of the left against the platform on a major issue, without any parallel in previous Conferences, and revealing the advance of a new balance of forces within the labour movement: a victory, not only for the freedom of the press, but also in fact for greater unity and co-operation (the formal vote on co-operation was unrepresentative, owing to a miscasting of mandated votes on technical grounds). Given leadership, there was all the basis for a magnificent response within that Conference. But the lack of leadership led to a spectacle of confusion, division of purpose, equal division of voting on the main current political issue, the electoral truce, and consequent uncertainty of orientation menacing at such a time as this in the second political party composing the Government, and especially in the political party officially representing the organised labour movement.

THIS weakness of current leadership was shown in the lack of concern with the practical problems of the war and of the military situation, and substitution of general resolutions of social and economic policy, mostly with a post-war angle of emphasis; the almost complete unconcern with the war in most of the speeches and absorbed concern with questions of electoral advantage; the complete ignoring of the main issue of the present situation, the Second Front, save for a sneering reference in the chairman's speech; and the vacillating and contradictory position revealed in the very narrow majority of the Executive on the question of the electoral truce and closer co-operation of the parties supporting the Government in by-elections. One section openly advocated Labour withdrawal from the Government, with the avowed aim, according to one prominent speaker, of bringing down the Government in a week, without any sign of understanding how this would weaken Britain's role in the war and open the way to a more reactionary combination. Another section sought the contradictory compromise of maintaining Labour participation in the Government, but simultaneously conducting electoral fights between the parties composing the Government. The official view defended Labour participation in the Government and the electoral truce, but in a half-hearted and apologetic fashion, such as strongly suggested close prior divisions within the Executive, but with no living presentation of the conception of national unity against Fascism or of the role of the labour movement, and simultaneously opposing unity of the labour movement. The net effect of these divisions is to weaken the political role of the labour movement, provide a happy hunting ground for the disruptive "independent" candidates, and open the door to the destructive manoeuvres of the Munichites.

THE path forward in this situation can only lie along the lines, not of negative abstentions, opposition to necessary unity against Fascism, or political passivity, but in the active and positive role of a united labour movement within national unity on the basis of the urgent immediate tasks for speediest victory over Fascism. This was the path which was clearly shown at the Communist Party Conference which preceded the Labour Party Conference. The strength of the Communist Party Conference, whose resolutions and proceedings are recorded elsewhere, lay not only in the closeness of its representation to the key workers in war industry, and the advancing strength and unity of the membership, comprising now 53,000 active members, fighting for the interests and unity of the whole labour movement, but in the positive programme put forward on all the urgent current issues of the fight for victory over Fascism and the tasks of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labour movement in this fight. This Conference, meeting on May 23–24, took place at the same time as the negotiations which were leading to the Anglo-Soviet Treaty and the understanding on the Second Front. It is only necessary to compare the leadership of the Conference with the outcome of these negotiations to see how close this leadership was to the vital questions which were at that moment confronting the nations united in the fight against Fascism.

THE Communist Party Conference met on the eve of the new situation created by the Anglo-Soviet Treaty and the agreement in relation to the Second Front in Europe in 1942. The greatest responsibilities now open out in the fight for the speediest fulfilment of these decisions and the mobilisation of the united fighting will and determination of the nation behind the Second Front and all that it involves. In the field of production, with special reference to mining, shipbuilding and building, as well as the direct munitions industries, the needs are now and will be very much further intensified. The question of the use of shipping and further development of food production needs urgent attention. In the political field it is necessary to extend the co-operation of all parties and organisations, no longer only on the basis of Anglo-Soviet unity and the general aims of the United Nations, but specifically on the basis of the Second Front and fulfilment of all requirements of the Second Front. To strengthen morale, stronger measures should be taken against the Mosleyites, Munichites, pro-Fascists and their publications, while the *Daily Worker* should be immediately restored as the most powerful popular rallying organ for the tasks of the Second Front. Above all, the building up of unity of the labour movement becomes more than ever essential.

WE have passed the first half of 1942 without yet decisive action in the West, though with a notable advance in preparedness, in popular demand in the offensive spirit, and in the beginnings of offensive action, as shown in the mass air raids. We are now entering the second half of 1942, the critical year. The agreements of May 26 have provided a favourable basis for the advance to a united strategy and united action in the second half of 1942. We need to utilise these possibilities to the utmost in order to speed our action directed towards the supreme aim of delivering the decisive blows for the downfall of Hitlerism in 1942.

R. P. D.

BRITAIN IN THE WORLD FRONT

THE PRIVATE EDITION for LABOUR MONTHLY *readers of this new work by R. Palme Dutt (to which we invited all subscribers to "Crisis of the British People" to transfer their orders) is now being despatched. In these next weeks those who sent their subscription direct to this office will receive their copies by post. All others should get in touch with the bookshops or persons to whom they gave their order.*

THE PUBLIC EDITION is advertised on the back page. By reason of paper shortage, this edition is not unlimited and we would counsel the immediate placing of orders with bookshops.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Anglo-Soviet Treaty

by QUAESTOR

THE Anglo-Soviet Treaty of Alliance in the war against Hitlerite Germany and her associates in Europe, and of collaboration and mutual assistance thereafter, signed in London on May 26, 1942, has justly been acclaimed throughout the world as an historic international act.

Its outstanding significance for the world to-day is its immense strengthening of the coalition of freedom-loving peoples for the destruction of the Nazi régime. Even formally the advance on the agreement signed in Moscow on July 12, 1941, by Cripps and Molotov is very striking. In that agreement the two Governments undertook to render each other assistance and support in the war against Hitlerite Germany. In the new Treaty the relations between the two Powers are definitely proclaimed to be an alliance. Furthermore, they undertake assistance and support of all kinds to each other in the war against Germany " and all those States which are associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe." This additional clause registers not only the war of Great Britain and the Soviet Union against Italy, and the British declarations of war last year against Finland, Hungary and Rumania ; it also involves the hostility of Great Britain to the puppet régimes in Slovakia, Norway and Belgium which are sending cannon fodder to the Eastern Front, and constitutes a plain warning to the rulers of Spain, Vichy and Bulgaria not to be over-impudent in the assistance they are already covertly affording the Hitlerite aggression.

Again, Clause 2 of the agreement of last July provided that neither party would negotiate or conclude an armistice or peace treaty except by mutual agreement. In the new Treaty, this undertaking is extended, as in Article I, to cover any other State associated with Germany in acts of aggression in Europe. But there is more. The new Treaty provides that there are to be no negotiations " with the Hitlerite Government or any other Government in Germany that does not clearly renounce all aggressive intentions." This addition is of the utmost importance. It is a guarantee against the creation of a new, seemingly different form of authority by the same dark forces who rule Germany through Hitler—with the hope that they will be able to curry favour with like-minded elements abroad, just as the Junkers and the Krupps did in 1919–20 and thereafter, when by massacring the flower of the German workers they were able to establish the semblance of a democratic republic. At the same time, the new clause leaves the door open for the Allies to negotiate with a Government in Germany that has given unmistakable signs of determination to rid the German people and the world of that sinister survival of the Middle Ages, reinforced by modern technique, embodied in the feudal-militarist-imperialist ruling clique of Germany.

These guarantees, embodied in Part I of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty, would not by themselves have been enough to arouse the enthusiasm, in all countries where people can speak their mind, which the newspapers have reported. What gave them point was the declaration simultaneously made in the two communiqués, published about Molotov's visit to London and Washington, that in each case " a full understanding was reached with regard to the urgent tasks of creating a Second Front in Europe in 1942." Both communiqués pointed out that the Chiefs of Staff, military and naval, took part in the discussions on this question with the Soviet representatives, who in London in addition had with them representatives of the Soviet fighting services. Thus the communiqués made it clear that the " urgent tasks " referred to were discussed already in their strategical aspect. After stating that discussions also took place on the improvement of supplies of aeroplanes, tanks and war materials to the Soviet Union, this section of the two communiqués ended by stating the gratification of both sides at " the identity of their views on all the above questions "—thereby stressing that the full understanding, referred to earlier, is not merely a diplomatic phrase to cover up divergence or even opposing viewpoints expressed in the discussion—as is often the case with such formulae—but actually reflected identical views on what had to be done.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These communiqués, particularly this section of them, have rightly been underlined in comment all over the world. They make it clear to enemy and friend alike that the question of the Second Front, as the practical and immediate expression of the alliance, is not merely a matter of popular clamour. True, agreement as to the measures needed for a Second Front in 1942 does not necessarily mean that those measures can be regarded as having been already adopted. The greatest efforts are now called for, in the sphere of production and in the vigilant struggle against enemies of the Soviet Union, if the obligations entered into by the British and United States Governments to the Soviet Government are to be carried through swiftly, smoothly and effectively. A sufficiently eloquent proof of this was given by the *Sunday Times*, organ of the Munichite Lord Kemsley and distinguished by its years of hostility to the Soviet Union, in its first number after the Treaty had been published (June 14). In a long editorial analysis of the Treaty it managed not to mention the Second Front at all, instead alluding obscurely at the tail-end of its article to agreement between the Allies on "matters of high moment for the successful prosecution of the war in 1942." But what the *Sunday Times* did manage to do was to give very considerable space to a dispatch from its special correspondent in New York, saying that the reference to the Second Front in the communiqué was "obviously ambiguous, and many people here, taking note of its reported reception and interpretation in Russia, are alarmed lest something strategically unsound may be attempted."

The correspondent did not mention whether the "many people" are the unabashed Fifth Column of Catholic, Isolationist, pro-Franco, pro-Hitler and anti-Soviet propagandists who are still running riot in the U.S.A., undermining the war effort of their country. It can at all events be said that the attitude of the *Sunday Times* is more ambiguous than the communiqués; and the fact that this important Tory organ should venture to continue the fight against the Second Front in this underhand way shows what a fight has still to be made to implement the Treaty.

There is a further special and historic importance in this Treaty. As the *Daily Telegraph* declared in its leading article on June 12, the articles in Part II, which follow the military undertakings of the Treaty, establish a much closer alliance than that which existed between Britain and France in the last war, "and indeed an alliance for which our country has no precedent." At the other end of the political rainbow the *Manchester Guardian* wrote that under the Treaty, "two Powers commanding great resources and immense potential strength undertake the most direct obligations to Europe. They form an alliance, not like the Triple and Dual Alliances, which were merely instruments for mutual protection, but an alliance that aims at shielding Europe. Their mutual pledges form a sheltering screen behind which Europe can organise her security and economic life on new principles—those of the Atlantic Charter." The formation of such an alliance is in itself an unprecedented thing; but equally important is the change which it implies in the attitude to the U.S.S.R. On this aspect *The Times* comment was equally instructive, when it said that the Treaty "carries with it an ungrudging recognition by Great Britain that, just as Russian power and endurance will have played a major part in winning the victory, so Russian security will inevitably prove, when the time comes, to be one of the essential and irreplaceable pillars of any European settlement."

The close examination of Part II of the Treaty, including all the articles from the third onwards, fully justifies these statements.

In the first place, while declaring their readiness to unite with other like-minded States in adopting proposals for common action "to preserve peace and resist aggression in the post-war period," Great Britain and the Soviet Union pledge themselves to immediate mutual support against any further aggression by their present joint enemies for twenty years, and thereafter unless terminated by twelve months' notice. This is a fact of great significance. For the first time since 1917, Great Britain has signed a political Treaty with the Soviet Union, moreover one which carries with it such a massive obligation as alliance for twenty years.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No one henceforward can doubt the colossal strength which can be mobilised, for maintaining peace after the war, by fully implementing the Treaty. This is precisely what was lacking during the years in which the Soviet Union fought for collective security against the aggressor bloc which was attacking successfully in Ethiopia, in Spain, in China, in Austria and in Czechoslovakia. As Mr. Lloyd George said in the House of Commons on June 11, had the Treaty been a fact some years ago, "many grave blunders in foreign policy would have been avoided. Not only that—this war could never have occurred."

It is useful to recall the previous approach to anything similar between Britain and Russia—the Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907, which in face of the growing danger of a world war deliberately turned in the direction of a division of the spoils in the Near and Middle East. The contrast between that agreement and the Treaty of 1942 is yet another measure of the change made in the international situation by the existence of the Soviet Union, in place of Tsarist Russia.

Secondly, Britain and the Soviet Union agree to work together "in close and friendly collaboration after the re-establishment of peace for the organisation of security and economic prosperity in Europe. They will take into account the interests of the United Nations in these objects, and they will act in accordance with the two principles of not seeking territorial aggrandisement for themselves and of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States. The High Contracting Parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war. Each High Contracting Party undertakes not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against the other High Contracting Party."

In these provisions, taken together with the military co-operation provided in the earlier articles, can be seen the entire framework of a new attempt to ensure peaceful collaboration after the war between the Socialist and capitalist States, and to reduce the dangers of war between the capitalist States themselves.

The Soviet Union since June 22 of last year has made several specific declarations of its readiness for such an attempt. At the Inter-Allied Conference held at St. James's Palace on September 24 of last year, Maisky made a statement of Soviet foreign policy which contained the following points: (1) the Soviet Union defends the right of every nation to the independence and territorial integrity of its country, and its right to establish such a social order, and to choose such a form of government, as it deems opportune and necessary for the better promotion of its economic and cultural prosperity; (2) the Soviet Union has untiringly and resolutely advocated, and advocates to-day, the necessity of collective action against aggressors; (3) the Soviet Union has been, and still is, building its foreign policy upon the desire to maintain peaceful and neighbourly relations with all countries which respect the integrity and inviolability of its borders; (4) the Soviet Union was and is willing to render all possible assistance to peoples becoming victims of aggression and fighting for the independence of their native land; (5) the Soviet Government proclaims its agreement with the fundamental principles of the Atlantic Charter, and states that a consistent application of these principles will secure the most energetic support on the part of the Government and peoples of the Soviet Union; (6) the Soviet Government attributes great importance to the equitable use of all material resources and foodstuffs in the post-war period.

It will be sufficient to compare the points of this speech with those embodied in the Anglo-Soviet Treaty to realise that the mutual obligations now undertaken by the British and Soviet Governments fit in completely with declared Soviet foreign policy, and consequently that the full implementing of the Treaty by both sides will really constitute an important advance after the war towards international peace.

This advance *is* important. Quite recently very different views were receiving a great deal of publicity in this country. For example, Mr. McKenzie King, the Canadian Prime Minister, was allowed to get away with a statement on September that "if a new world order based upon freedom is to assume definite shape, it can only be effective through the leadership of the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States of America." Again, the pamphlet issued

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the group calling itself "P.E.P" and composed of intellectuals active in various Government and near-Government organisations, stated on December 9 that, owing to various difficulties supposedly facing the U.S.S.R. after the war, " the U.S.S.R. may well come to regard the acceptance by Britain of a leading role in Europe as a far more realistic means of ensuring stability in Europe as a whole than any attempt to impose a doubtfully acceptable leadership from the East." The same profound thought was elaborated later in the *Observer*, in two articles inspired by the "P.E.P" group (December 21 and January 18). The idea of honest and straightforward collaboration with the U.S.S.R. never crossed the mind of such people. One may be pardoned for supposing that the victories of the Red Army had something to do with a change in the atmosphere. At all events, after the Treaty, there should be no room for subtle anti-Soviet propaganda of this kind.

Thirdly, the Treaty represents a heavy blow for Hitler and all the Fascist coalition. As Molotov said at the Foreign Office after the signature of the Treaty : "Hitler and his accomplices in their bloodstained robbery in Europe will now feel more than ever that the united forces of their adversaries have been rallied and strengthened. So much the better for us, for our peoples, for our common cause." The stunned silence with which the Nazi Foreign Office and radio stations met the Treaty ; then the period of days during which, while muttering some embarrassed platitudes for foreign consumption, the Fascist spokesmen kept all knowledge of the Treaty from their home public ; and finally the torrent of abuse of Britain with which they attempted to deafen the German people all at once, when at last they did pluck up courage to tell them about the Treaty—all these are signs of the confusion caused in the Nazi camp.

The fact is, not that the Treaty put an end to Hitler's supposed hopes of a separate peace with the U.S.S.R.—as a variety of malicious chatterers, from Mr. Harold Nicolson and the Imperial Policy Group to certain members of the Labour Party Executive were insinuating quite recently—but that it puts an end to Hitler's hope that, by agitating the bogy of European Communism before the eyes of the British Government, he would succeed in frightening Britain into a separate peace.

The Treaty, then, is a great achievement. It offers great hopes for the future. But like all great achievements, it will turn into its own opposite if the British workers allow it to become a source of complacency instead of a spur to greater effort. There is every need of greater effort. The Treaty has yet to be implemented, first and foremost by the opening of a Second Front. There is every need for watchfulness against complacency. Certain groupings—from the newspapers, politicians and writers dealt with in another article in this number to those of the Labour Party Executive who were spreading anti-Soviet insinuations among conference delegates at the very time that Molotov was at the Foreign Office, and since then trying their best behind the scenes to disrupt the nation-wide meetings of solidarity with the U.S.S.R. on June 21–22—all these are real and dangerous influences, which have to be fought if the Treaty is to be made triumphant reality.

The British people have displayed the vigour necessary for beating off more than one attack of the Fascists and their allies, however. The signing of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty is as much a tribute to their persistence as to that of their Soviet comrades. The British people have the means to defeat these latest machinations of the enemy in their midst, and to ensure that the Anglo-Soviet Treaty really becomes the opening of a new page in world history.

Notice to Readers! **The ban on the export of the LABOUR MONTHLY, imposed just two years ago, has not yet been lifted, in spite of repeated representations. Readers who feel strongly about this should take the trouble to write to their M.P. about it—and to the Ministry of Information.**

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labour Party Conference

What was missing?

by WILLIAM GALLACHER, M.P.

THE great Communist Party Conference held in the Stoll Theatre on May 23 and 24 was remarkable for its youth and for the eager, enthusiastic energy displayed by its thousand delegates. The brilliant lead given by Harry Pollitt was followed up by delegate after delegate. Unity of aim and method was the keynote of the Conference. The delegates knew the tasks that lay before them and every one of them was keen to get ahead with the job.

What a contrast was offered by the Labour Party Conference which opened on Monday, May 25! It was not just a question of the aged appearance of the Labour Party Conference—something that was mentioned in most of the press reports, and which in itself gave a tired appearance to the proceedings as against the lively and self-confident tone of the Communist Party Conference. No. The trouble was much deeper than a mere matter of age. Whereas the delegates to the Communist Party Conference had work to do and knew how to do it, the delegates to the Labour Party Conference (or many of them) wanted to work but felt that the Executive was determined to keep them as far away from work as possible.

This was the real cause of the sullen, suspicious attitude towards the platform, the cause of the deep rift between the delegates and the leadership of the Party. The delegates wanted something to do; if the Executive could not provide it, they would find it for themselves, by breaking the electoral truce and thereby securing freedom of movement in the constituencies. They nearly succeeded in defeating the Executive on this. They have assuredly made the electoral truce much more difficult to operate by the weight of the vote they cast against. Yet they were all wrong in thinking their salvation lay in such a direction. Breaking the electoral truce would get them nowhere. It would simply spread confusion and disruption, and play beautifully into the hands of the hidden friends of Fascism in this country.

True, there is need for a democratic method of selecting candidates, such as has been proposed by the Communist Party; but that is very far different from all-in fights at every by-election.

The first resolution on the agenda was a "victory" resolution. Mr. Attlee, deputy Prime Minister and leader of the Labour Party, spoke on this resolution. He spoke of the great number of nations associated with the cause of freedom, of the diversity of political and economic outlook they represented. He showed the contrast between Communism in the Soviet Union and extreme individualism in America, with—he said—Britain somewhere in between. But, he went on, we found it necessary to sink our political differences and to unite on a common platform in order to face up to the task we had on hand. There was something the delegates might have seized hold of, had their political sense not been almost completely dulled by incessant prohibitions and "black circulars" issued by Transport House. What chance is there of united nations if there is disunity within the nations themselves? To have effective unity of the nations, there must be the most far-reaching unity of the peoples who make up the nations. But the delegates listened to Attlee lay down the principle of sinking political differences in order to achieve unity—and then they proceeded to outlaw the Labour Research Department and to classify Anglo-Soviet Committees, and even the Dean of Canterbury's Council for Medical Aid to the Soviet Union, as subversive organisations. This is not only the opposite of "sinking political differences"; it is the actual manufacturing of political differences where they do not exist, in order to complete the paralysis of the Labour Movement.

For this is the cause of the deep division between the delegates and the Executive. The movement is hamstrung. Its vital nerves have been cut and destroyed by prohibitions and "black circulars." The members feel impotent and helpless. There is nothing they can do. They are barred

PRODUCED 2005 BY MARX
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

completely from every form of political activity. True, they did a grand job on the *Daily Worker* resolution; but this was as a consequence of a great campaign brilliantly conducted by Comrade Rust and the *Daily Worker* staff. But it was something that the delegates could get their teeth into, and the spontaneous enthusiasm affecting not only delegates but visitors showed how keen they were to become a living part of the political life of the country. But they had already missed their chance.

The resolution of unity provided the opportunity for breaking down the dam so carefully constructed by Transport House. Every form of political activity would have been open to them. But they did not understand. Fooled by the mirage of the electoral truce, they went chasing after the shadow and let the substance go. The local labour parties do not want to die. They want to live, but they realise they can only live if they are engaged in some form of political activity. But every avenue of activity is barred to them. They must not associate with this, they must not identify themselves with that, they must keep absolutely clear of the other; they must not, in fact, participate in or associate in any way with any committee or any movement with which Communists are associated, and that means that they must not participate in working-class activity of any kind.

That is what is killing the labour movement. The fall in individual membership of the Labour Party during the past few years has been catastrophic. The Executive tries to explain it by the circumstances of the war, omitting to mention that if millions have been called to the Colours, new millions have come into industry and a new political awakening is arousing the people everywhere. It is a time when a virile party attracts masses to its ranks. But the Labour Party is losing membership by the thousand. 200,000 have gone since 1937. The rot had set in long before the war, long before the electoral truce, and were it not for the affiliations of the trade unions the Labour Party would be hopelessly bankrupt. MacDonald and Snowden set the pace and the policy for disunity, Attlee and Morrison have carried on their disastrous policy, until the stage has been reached where the Labour Party in many parts of the country is virtually faced with extinction unless it can break the shackles that have been fastened upon it. There is no hope for them if all they can find to do is to break the electoral truce and go chasing after all kinds of political adventurers who seek, by spreading confusion and disruption, to serve their own or more sinister ends. Such feverish, spasmodic activity only furthers the decay and hastens the end.

Unity of the working-class movement as the solid foundation on which alone real National Unity can be built, is the solution to the problem of life or death that faces the Labour Party. "We must sink our political differences." Yes, says Attlee, Yes, says Morrison, with the Tories, with the Liberals. We'll make unity up above; but below, among the masses, NO. We refuse to make unity with the Communists.

But unless the foundation is firmly laid, unless we have a strong united working class, their position becomes one of almost complete dependence on the Tories and the Liberals. The local labour parties feel that; the delegates to the Conference expressed it. These are not strong men upheld by a strong movement, but weak men who are used by the Tories and then (like Grenfell) discarded when their time of service is exhausted.

If the Government truly expressed the political feeling of this country, it would be a government well to the left of its present make-up. It would be a government predominantly Labour, instead of a government predominantly Tory.

To get such a change in the Government it is necessary to get unity of all working-class forces. The Labour Party in the country wants to see such a change. It must take the measures necessary to ensure it.

Such a campaign as was made for the *Daily Worker* must now be made for Unity. That is the great issue that stands before the Labour Party—revealed in every session of the Labour Party Conference.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Dark Forces

by R. PAGE ARNOT

THE conclusion of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty of Alliance and the understanding for the creation of a Second Front in Europe in 1942 has brought new hopes both for a speedy and successful conclusion of the war and for the future maintenance of peace. But it also brings new obligations upon the people of this country: for it makes the need of national unity greater than ever, if the provisions of the treaty are to be fulfilled. And on the other hand it makes it more than ever essential that no dark and hostile forces should be allowed to develop their undermining of the united national front.

It is not easy to bring together classes, castes, social stratifications, trades, professions, nationalities, town and country, old and new, into a united national front. It isn't even easy to get the formal top structure into a first shape of unity (the parties making electoral truce and forming coalition Government) and certainly not easy to maintain it. To reach a higher stage of national unity, when every organisation and grouping, every authority and department, every man and woman is tuned to concert pitch and each playing a part in the symphony of production and war, is a task full of difficulties requiring the utmost from every one of us. But on top of all these difficulties, arising each day and week and mocking all partial achievements, it is infuriating to find the ostrich attitude to the enemies of the united national front, the happy-go-lucky assumption that they do not exist because they are not making public speeches or rude attacks and propaganda. Quislings do not advertise themselves. It is not their method; and indeed their efficiency at one stage is spoiled if they be visible.

Perhaps the most glaringly short-sighted example of this heedlessness is the widespread view (and still more widely spread since the Treaty announcement) that Munichism is a thing of the past. This view can only be held by forgetting or ignoring the meaning of Munich. Munich was not a single act of abject surrender to Fascism; Munich was the culmination of a foreign policy of at least seven years from September, 1931, when Sir John Simon at Geneva put the case for Japanese aggression in Manchuria. Throughout all the years marked by the Anglo-German Naval Treaty (which legalised the Nazi building of the submarines that are now sinking British vessels); by the Hoare-Laval Pact of November, 1935; by the refusal to the Spanish Republican Government of the arms to which they were entitled by international law; by the rest of the "non-intervention" in Spain; by the connivance at the seizure of Austria (that brought the resignation of Mr. Eden and Lord Cranborne); and by the hostility to the popular fronts in France and Spain that Baldwin-Chamberlain foreign policy was actively in operation. When finally on September 30, 1938, Chamberlain and Daladier sat down at Munich with Hitler and Mussolini and made the agreement by which an Anglo-French ultimatum forced the Czecho-Slovaks to surrender their defences (and our defences) to Nazi Germany, the meaning of the seven years' policy stood out clearly enough. The Soviet Union was plainly to be isolated. The Socialist power which had stood for a policy of peace and non-aggression, which had maintained that policy of collective security to which representatives of the Western Powers had paid lip service, was to be thrust out of the concert of Europe. The essence of Munich was revealed in the attitude to the U.S.S.R. To-day, though under vastly altered circumstances, this issue is still alive. *The attitude to the U.S.S.R. is still the touchstone of British political life.*

There is no question of politics or strategy to which this does not apply. The building of the United National Front depends on the strength and development of the Anglo-Soviet Alliance, just as the safety so far of these islands from invasion has depended on the strength and development of the Red Army, as millions of the British people thankfully acknowledge. The new Munichism consists in an attitude towards the Soviet Union which would hold back the further development and strengthening of the Alliance, looks with apprehension upon the growth of the influence of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

U.S.S.R. in Europe, and where it cannot complain of the action of the Soviet Union at the moment, mutters darkly about the possible action of the Soviet Union in the future. To do this is to sow distrust between Allies and this is always of service to the enemy.

Though this should be plain enough there are still those who blandly assume that a United National Front exists so fully and strongly that within it the luxury of party strife and quarrelling can easily be afforded; and, on the other hand, those who mistake every shrub for an enemy and are so disgusted with the succession of obstacles to unity that they see in every vested interest a conscious enemy, and presently come to believe that a United National Front in a class society is impossible. They fail to distinguish clearly between the Munichites and vested interests. It is only when the resistance of vested interests to changes is carried to the point of endangering measures and transformations necessary for victory that they begin to undermine the very basis of National Unity.

Who are they, these dark forces? The question to ask is rather, "Where are they?" They are where they were—entrenched in industry, in military circles, in the Government service, in politics and business. It would be absurd to suppose that the few hundreds* in Brixton Gaol and other places of detention are the dark forces, though the recent "coddling" treatment is an ugly reminder both of their own role—and of the presence of influences anxious to give them protection; nor is it likely that a secret service still largely devoting its time to espionage upon Communists and militants within all Government departments and services will be likely to discover the real "dark forces." No miraculous conversion of the thousands of the potential Fifth Column is to be expected, nor has there been any suggestion that it has taken place. Certainly the public announcement and explicit repudiation of sin and transgression—that is, of treachery to the interests of the people of Britain—has not been reported in any of the newspapers. And if it has been confessed in the circles of the "Oxford Group" the silence that Buchman maintained about his attitude to the Nazis has been faithfully observed by his disciples.

What are they doing? They are carrying on activities directed against the United National Front, against the Second Front and the Anglo-Soviet Alliance. Step by step as the struggle for victory in 1942 becomes keener, and as collaboration between Britain and the U.S.S.R. begins to bear fruit, the dark forces become frantically active.

How do they operate? Is it by sabotage, by giving aid and comfort to the enemy, by direct pro-Nazi or pro-Japanese propaganda? No, sabotage would be too un-subtle in Britain in 1942, though there is perhaps reason to think that it is behind certain flagrant cases of hold-ups in production; nor is open incitement along the line of "don't produce" subtle enough. Rather the whispering campaign takes the line of raising such questions as, "If maximum production is organised now, where shall we be after the war?"; and "If everything is thrown into the war effort now, shall we not have sacrificed our markets to the United States after the war?"; and "If we open up the best seams for victory now, we shall have nothing to fall back upon when the struggle for trade begins after the war, and what sort of price shall we get for the worst seams?"

Or again, the argument about the Second Front was no longer that it would harm the cherished project of Munich (referred to in the House of Commons debate on British rearmament of November 5, 1936) to let Germany and the Soviet Union exterminate one another; but instead it was put about—and with particular virulence during the two or three weeks before the announcement of the new Treaty and of the understanding on the Second Front in 1942—that the Second Front, however desirable, is entirely impracticable, that there are not enough ships, that there are not enough of this or that essential, that we must wait for the Americans, that we must wait for the spring of 1943 or possibly the autumn of 1943, etc., etc.

*The following are the numbers of British subjects detained under Regulation 18B:—

Dates	Released	New Detentions	Total
To 31st August, 1941	31	4	718
1st-30th September	28	1	692
1st-31st October	26	4	669
1st-30th November	14	3	658
1st-31st March, 1942	16	0	583

PRODUCED 2005 BY UN2.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All of these activities cover up conscious Fascists, pro-Fascists and Munichites as well as revealing naked class prejudice and class interests. Let us see some indications in these last few weeks of what operations have been carried on. From these it will be seen that the lords and knights of Munich frantically busied themselves rallying to the slogan :—

" Wave, Munich, all thy banners wave,
And charge with all thy chivalry."

Precisely at this moment, a year after Britain and the U.S.S.R. became allies and when the Nazi troops are in tensest struggle with the Red Army, the Munichites have been once more extremely active. Their whispering campaign of the last nine months gathers reinforcement and parliamentary intrigues (such as the attempt to weaken the Prime Minister as Minister of Defence) are succeeded by menacing deputations. Major Victor Cazalet, M.P., with many connections in the City, organises behind the scenes. According to the *New Statesman and Nation*, he or his friends are able to get

" 62 M.P.'s lined up on a policy which is certainly not that of the British Government towards the Soviet Union. They claim to have taken a deputation of 18 M.P.'s to exert pressure upon the Foreign Secretary . . . "

Now Major Victor Cazalet is not personally very important ; nor should his position as liaison officer with General Sikorsky be taken to mean that the Polish Government itself have had any part in these intrigues. But the tendency he represents in the City and in certain circles is not only important but thoroughly dangerous to national unity. How is it that some 60 M.P.s could accept Cazalet as their fugleman ? Look at the House of Commons, elected in 1935 with its majority then pledged to the policies of Baldwin and Chamberlain. Some of them kept queer company. The Anglo-German Fellowship and the Friends of National Spain contained the names of over a score of parliamentarians, some of whom, like Commander Bower, M.P., have been particularly outspoken in their attacks on the Prime Minister. Few of them are " distinguished parliamentarians," but they have influential acquaintances or connections ; and in the Anglo-German Fellowship they had the privilege of being associated with many directors of the banks and insurance companies, including the Bank of England, the Midland Bank and Lloyds Bank, and with leading figures in such gigantic monopolies as Lever Bros. and Unilevers Ltd., Imperial Chemical Industries, to name only the very biggest. No doubt these gentlemen have all changed their views about fellowship with the Nazis, but it is too much to expect that they cut one another dead when they meet in the City of London or in Pall Mall.

Then there is the 1922 Committee, whose normal existence as the parliamentary Tory Party, the organisation of the back-benchers, can at chosen moments be transformed into a committee of reactionary revolt against the Prime Minister and the Coalition Government. Ordinarily the 1922 Committee presents the quiet appearance of a sylvan lake, where great alders and willows drowse upon the bank and see their leafy branches reflected in the still water. But there are days when the calm surface is broken, the waters are troubled and there appear seething whirlpools in whose depths the agitated alders behold fantastic and frightening shapes of revolution, change and ruin. This is the chosen time, before the storm has dwindled to a calm, for those who fish in troubled waters ; and the Men of Munich, like their patron Chamberlain, are skilled fishermen. The coal rationing scheme of May was upset by such a storm ; more recently Mr. Erskine Hill, M.P., Chairman of the 1922 Committee, as well as some of the members, was hooked by Captain Cazalet for his anti-Soviet deputation.

A new and regrettable recruit in this field is Mr. Harold Nicolson, M.P., a B.B.C. Governor, cradled in the Foreign Office and cursed with a literary pen. Naively, in his " Marginal Comment " in the *Spectator*, he blurts out what was uppermost in his mind. Addressing meetings he is " touched and disconcerted " by the enthusiasm expressed for "Russia." The Soviet Union may make a separate peace, he insinuates, and imagines what offers can be made to it by Hitler, who—

[Hitler] is in the position if necessary to offer rich rewards to Russia in return for an eastern peace. He could promise to give her, if he wins, not the Straits only, but the Persian Gulf and the whole Empire of India. What counter-offers could the United Nations oppose to such extreme generosity ?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When he goes on to argue against putting all our "eggs in the Soviet basket," the point is not the imaginative possibility of the offers that Hitler might make (Hitler is capable of anything), but the fact of Mr. Nicolson's impudently issuing a warning that such offers might be accepted.

We may be grateful to Mr. Nicolson for letting the cat out of the bag with an astonishing naïveté of which he must now be bitterly repentant when it draws from no less a figure than Lord Kemsley's editor the retort about :—

malevolent suggestions that Russia might at some-time or somehow conclude a separate peace with Germany.—*Sunday Times*, June 14, 1942.

Even some in Government circles have sought to use these Hitlerite insinuations as a reason for not lifting the ban on the *Daily Worker*, and in the discussion on this question at the Labour Party Conference this same argument was used, though in a veiled form.

Then another stage of the attack on the Anglo-Soviet Alliance is brought forward under the specious form of a "statesman-like" article in the *Nineteenth Century and After* by its editor, Mr. F. A. Voigt, author of an anti-Soviet book "Aut Caesar aut Nullus." Those who have seen this obscure periodical with others of its kind cluttering up the tables of public libraries, as the eighteenth-century statuary of nonentities clutters up Westminster Abbey, should remember that such an article needs only to be cabled to America and then the substance of it cabled back to Lord Kemsley's newspapers for the Voigt squeak to become amplified and fully audible to millions. The tone of the article can be gathered from the following citations :—

Russia is not, and never has been, a democracy —and perhaps never will be.

Whether Russia can be part of any European system must remain an open question. Her future is as uncertain as that of any country in Europe.

In Volhynia and Eastern Galicia, in Estonia and Lithuania, the Russians deported *or executed* writers, lawyers, politicians and almost all who played a prominent part in the national life. . . . Communists in the regions occupied by the Russians were, for the most part, executed. . . .

It is particularly important that Great Britain make no concessions, that are not essential to victory over the Germans, in Eastern Europe. This is true even of the three Baltic States, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. . . . No one can tell what frontiers, even of the smallest and seemingly weakest States, will be in the interests of England and most favourable to the balance of power, because the condition of Eastern Europe as it will be at the end of this war is unpredictable.

In arguments destructive of Federal Union proposals (no longer in fashion in the hangers-on of the Foreign Office), eschewing any really close relations with the U.S.S.R., and aiming instead at a future Franco-British alliance, Mr. F. A. Voigt has his eyes so firmly fixed on the past that he slews it round to the future ; and in his limbo of vain imaginings actually suggests that the time perhaps will come—

when it will be seen that Marshal Petain will have played a decisive part in promoting the final defeat of the Germans.

Philippe Pétain ? This Fascist, this ally ("collaborator") and accomplice of Hitler, this jailer and executioner of the French people ? It is difficult to find language adequate to deal with the brazen publication in an English journal of such an obscene attempt to justify Pétain, while Frenchmen are dying in Libya, facing firing squads in Nantes and Paris, and filling the prisons of Vichy.

Here, incidentally, there is a connection with the Vansittart type of propaganda which parades as the opposite to Munichism. Actually, the Vansittart denial of class struggle means a refusal to mobilise forces inside Germany against the Hitler clique and the German landlords, bankers and plutocrats ; and would deprive the people of this country of one of the most effective weapons for undermining the Nazi regime and bringing victory in 1942. But the special connection lies in a type of argument ("We shall smash Germany so utterly that it will be unnecessary on grounds of security for the U.S.S.R. to include the Baltic States or to have the frontiers of 1941"), which brings grist to the mill of those who are seeking to injure the Anglo-Soviet Alliance.

Where the *Nineteenth Century and After* had come out with such blatant anti-Soviet stuff, the old English friends of the Spanish Fascists felt it safe to come out of their holes. Mr. Kenneth de Courcy is their spokesman, and he has an advisory committee of which Lord Phillimore (head of the pro-Franco organisation in this country) is chairman and of which Lord Mansfield, Mr. W. Nunn, M.P.,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Victor Raikes, M.P., and Major A. R. Wise, M.P., are the members. In the *Review of World Affairs* dated June 1 an extreme " measure of detachment " is adopted to the Eastern Front.

Then comes a statement about the Germans that " faced by an Allied attack in the West, they might withdraw from Russia altogether, saving their internal political position by a far-reaching purge. The fate of our expedition would then entirely depend upon the Russian attitude to the new European situation thus created."

He is hard put to it for an argument who trots out this sort of stuff, which deludes only those still afflicted with the "Communazi" maniacal delusions of two years ago.

Somewhat inconsistently de Courcy goes on later to say that " Terror of Communism, which is widespread in Europe, is Hitler's strongest weapon." When, however, he deals with " the Russian Drama " he lets loose a flood of statements for which he gives no authority. For example :—

The capacity of Russia's remaining internal industries represents only a small part of her former total output.

Working hours in factories vary from between 14 and 16 hours a day with one rest of twenty-four hours per month.

Factory creches are provided though they are not much used, children generally being left at home—if necessary, alone.

There is only just enough food at present to keep the population alive and the position is deteriorating.

Finally, it appears that de Courcy has information about the Ukrainians, "quite a number of whom," he says, " have been induced to turn against the Russians. An organised force of about 150,000 strong already exists and is fighting in the German ranks at the front." Now this stuff from the Friends of Franco and sponsored by half a dozen Members of Parliament may appear to be just a tissue of absurdities. But much of Goebbels' propaganda also appears absurd. The fact is that there are people who swallow this stuff and regurgitate it genteelly in drawing-rooms, officers' messes and in country houses.

Captain J. E. Crowder, M.P., Secretary of the 1922 Committee, faithfully reported in Kemsley's *Sunday Times* of June 14, said to an audience in Finchley :

Of course, the outcome of the battles in the East between Russia and Germany are extremely important, but I do suggest we should keep our sense of proportion. Europe is not for us—as it is for Germany—the truly supreme stake in all senses.

Where have we heard that tune before? Why, in the utterances of the sapient Francophil, Mr. Kenneth de Courcy, who must be gratified to behold the swallow-and-regurgitation process at work with an official of the 1922 Committee.

Another form of attack is the renewal of speculation about the Eastern Front. The same whispers which bedevilled British strategy last autumn are now once more being put about : that " there is likelihood of a collapse in the Caucasus " ; that " if the Red Army succeeds there is no longer any need to continue sending supplies, but that if the Red Army be defeated then still less is there need to send supplies " ; that " the greater part of Soviet industries have been lost to the Germans and therefore supplies sent will soon fall into their hands " ; or alternatively that " nothing is known as to the output of Soviet industry, but it can be guessed to have reached a stage where supplies are no longer necessary." This barefaced attempt to break the Beaverbrook-Harriman agreement of last autumn or to prevent its renewal is aimed also at breaking the Anglo-Soviet Alliance ; for it could have no other effect and would indeed mean that it was the British Government that was preparing to make a deal with Hitler. Actually, not the British Government, but those circles in whom Hitler placed his hopes when he sent the butcher Hess to this country in May, 1941, are ready now, as they were ready then, to make a deal ; and their influence is still something to be guarded against.

Besides these various operations the dark forces in this country have as their main objective the ending of the United National Front and of the present Coalition Government representative of that United National Front. So long as National Unity exists they cannot hope to come out openly for Hitler. Their only hope to save Fascism is to break National Unity. For this purpose they are able to make use of situations and of persons who are utterly unconscious of playing into their hands.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The United National Front is not something fixed. It is a living outlook of the mass of the people in the fight against Fascism. At moments it can be strongly manifested, but there are depths as well as heights, failures as well as successes. To eliminate the failures, to multiply the successes, to increase the vigour of this outlook of the mass of the people is precisely the essence of the United National Front.

This essence cannot be distilled from the yeasty and multitudinous outlooks of the people except by the vigorous lead of a united working class. To bring about that working-class unity as a means to the higher forms of National Unity is not a question only of fighting apathy or indifference. It is necessary also to fight the dark forces that undermine the National United Front. It is a question of bringing to bear the strongest pressure upon those in authority to do their duty in dealing with the dark forces.

This sapping and undermining of unity, of the Anglo-Soviet Alliance, of the whole purpose of the United Nations in the war against Hitlerite Germany cannot be allowed to continue. It has gone on far too long already. The examples given earlier cannot be wholly explained away by regarding the writers as dupes or eccentrics or persons blinded by folly and class prejudice; for however true this may be in each particular case, as a whole they are clear evidence that dark forces are in operation behind. Nor can the War Cabinet afford, consistently with its duty and with the obligations it has assumed, to allow this wrecking and sapping to continue. It must surely be a matter of concern to the Government to take the necessary measures to prevent their signatures being dishonoured and their pledges frustrated by the activity of enemy agencies. But the Government's hands will be strengthened if the demand comes from the working class and the British people that all those really responsible for these Fascist and pro-Fascist activities *should be interned*. The more clearly and insistently this demand for their immediate internment is made the stronger will be the unity of the people, the surer will be the fulfilment of the alliance and the quicker the prospect of victory over Fascism.

Organisers of Victory

by ALLEN HUTT

"THIS is not a victory conference. It is a conference for the organisation of victory." Harry Pollitt spoke with especial emphasis when he uttered those two sentences in his concluding speech at the National Conference of the Communist Party held on May 23–24. As I heard him speak, and looking back afterwards, it struck me that these simple words summed up an assembly of the first importance for the war effort in general and the working-class movement in particular. No, it was not a victory conference; for this is no time for throwing up of hats and cheering (though the conference met in the stimulating atmosphere of the successful Kharkov offensive). Yet these solid ranks of delegates of the one British working-class Party which holds aloft, as it has always held, the banner of Marx, Lenin and Stalin, truly stood forth as the people's organisers of victory. Here were men and women, rooted deep among the brave, dogged and invincible mass of our working people, striving to make themselves the conscious and authoritative vanguard of their fellows in leading the universal struggle against the Fascist barbarians to speedy and final triumph. Not seeking in any exclusive way to push themselves and their Party to the fore, but rather aiming to be the shock-brigaders, the Stakhanovites if you will, of victory.

But before I go on to recall the main features of Pollitt's report and the keynotes of the Conference discussions, I am bound to record a contrast that hammered insistently at my mind the moment I walked into the vast auditorium of the Stoll Theatre, jammed to the doors with 1,300 delegates and over 1,000 visitors. For I could not help thinking of the first national conference of the Communist Party I ever attended (Battersea, 1922), when delegates and visitors together were able to cram into a tiny local hall, little more than a large room, in a back street

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

near Clapham Common. Twenty years ago the Party was carrying through the major reorganisation of its infancy, a process which for the first time broke with the sectarian sterility of the revolutionary groupings from which it had sprung. Its membership amounted to only some 2,500. To-day it is a Party no fewer than 53,000 strong, requiring one of the largest meeting-places in the metropolis to accommodate its delegates.

The contrast, I may add, is striking enough without going back twenty years. As late as 1935 it was possible for the National Council of Labour to seize on the Party's then membership figure of 7,000 as what it was pleased to call an "abject failure to secure a substantial membership," a sign of "negligible" strength. Where is that "abject failure" now? And if it was true, as it most certainly was, that 7,000 active and conscious Communists were never "negligible," what is to be said of a membership figure that surpasses the peak attained by the I.L.P. in those distant days when it dominated the Labour Party and counted in its ranks the majority of Labour M.P.s?

It is well that we Communists and the ever-growing army of our friends—not to mention those who can hardly be included in the latter category—should appreciate the significance of our present strength. In British conditions a working-class party which has a membership of over 50,000 has already begun to be a mass party. The point is pressed home by the remarkable triumph of the Party's £40,000 fund (which reached the impressive total of £47,000), and the equally remarkable figures of literature distributed during the year, totalling 1,145,000 pamphlets and 2,363,000 leaflets.

These quantitative achievements, however, are far from being the only matters worthy of remark. The conference itself illustrated, in the composition of its delegates, certain notable qualities of the Communist Party in its new stage of growth. They may be tabulated as follows :—

(1) *It is a Party of young people :* nearly 1,000 of the 1,300 delegates were under 40, and of these over 500 were under 30 years of age.

(2) *It is a Party of the key industrial workers :* there were nearly 700 delegates from the vital war industries of engineering (414), mining (73), railways and transport (72), shipbuilding (35), electrical and building trades (92).

(3) *It is a Party of leading trade unionists :* the trade union analysis paralleled the industrial analysis of the delegates, there being 260 members of the A.E.U., 142 T. & G.W.U., 72 M.F.G.B., 41 N.U.G.M.W., etc. There were 567 delegates returned as holding trade union official positions—415 local, 120 district, 32 national.

(4) *It is a Party which draws its new members into activity and responsibility :* of the delegates 574 had been members of the Party less than three years, while of these 340 had been members less than one year, and no fewer than 214 less than six months.

If we now turn to the report of the Central Committee, delivered by Harry Pollitt, there can be no two opinions as to its realistic, positive and responsible character, its closeness to the great issues of the day. This has, indeed, been sufficiently demonstrated since the conference. On the supreme issue of the Second Front in Europe, to which the conference gave its main attention, we now have the public agreement of the British, Soviet and American Governments. On the Anglo-Soviet Alliance we have had the Molotov visit and the signature of the Treaty of London. The cause of National Unity has scored a striking success in the Government candidate's resounding defeat of an unpleasant independent in the Llandaff and Barry by-election. The campaign for lifting the ban on the *Daily Worker* has been sensationally crowned by the endorsement of the Labour Party Conference.

These subsequent advances, nevertheless, absolutely fit in to, and serve to reinforce, the urgent policy outlined by Pollitt. In fact, while they are vastly encouraging and significant, they make our Party's policy, as expounded at the National Conference, more current and to the point than ever. Consider, from this point of view, the main heads of the Report. "The greatest opportunity is opening out for the combined action of the United Nations for the final defeat of Hitler. There can be no further delay," said Pollitt on May 23. Truer now than ever. And the Second Front is publicly and officially accepted as the key to victory.

It is now more urgent than ever to turn this key. To which the major contribution lies in Pollitt's demonstration that the Second Front is as much a political as it is a military question. This

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is equally true at all stages, alike in the campaign to secure the Second Front and in the even greater campaign to sustain it once it has been opened. Hence the primary importance of National Unity, and the support and strengthening of the Churchill Government as the representative of that unity; from which it naturally follows that the aim must be "to remove the still remaining reactionary Munichite elements, and bring in democratic anti-Fascist representatives enjoying popular confidence." Finally, and above all, it is the "united working-class movement that can by its power and initiative organise such national unity and victory." "The National Front must itself rest on the united front of the working class." Indeed—

> The working class has a decisive part to play, and it is in no way a betrayal of its independence for it to use its whole power and strength to weld together every section of the people in indestructible bonds of unity in this hour of common danger from Fascism. On the contrary, this policy achieves two things—it strengthens the nation as a whole, and it strengthens the power and influence of the working class in the leadership of the nation.

To us Communists, it will be seen, National Unity is a dynamic, a living conception; it is no shibboleth, no ready-made reach-me-down. As Pollitt said, it is something to be worked for, something to be fought for. The unity of the nation, in fact, is forged true and strong precisely in the fight against those who would disrupt it, whether ambitious and demogogic "independents" who seek to cash in on popular impatience, or the dark forces of giant monopoly and reactionary intrigue that strive to exploit every weakening of national unity in their own anti-popular interests. Pollitt's severe warnings in this connection are amply borne out by the anti-Soviet machinations of Major Cazalet (who has been alleged in the *New Statesman* to have the support of 62 M.P.s, including members of the 1922 Committee) and of the Imperial Policy Group.

Only from this positive viewpoint can we prescribe for the "Leftist" sicknesses in the Labour movement—produced by very natural frustration and resentment—whose symptoms have been the demands for the ending of the "political truce" or for the withdrawal of the Labour Party from the Government. The role of the Labour Party itself can be decisive here. If it—

> played a more active and decisive part in the Government; campaigned for a positive victory policy in the country; mobilised its entire membership to work and fight for it; and agreed to work in united action with all who are for the smashing of Fascism, then all these tendencies could be overcome.

In this same spirit it is possible to solve the peculiarly vexed problem of the by-elections. National Unity is once more the key. To give it just expression the selection of candidates certainly needs to be a far more representative and united affair; nor can the peculiar circumstances of every by-election be taken into account in advance; but the main line must be support of the Government candidate, irrespective of personal shortcomings and party label. Old prejudices against "voting for a Tory" or "voting for a Socialist" are quite unreal; the thing is—are you voting *for*, or *against*, national unity to win allied victory over Fascism?

Obviously linked with all that has already been said are the other major issues. "In the Battle of Production," declared Pollitt, "the trade union movement is the army that must conduct the campaign and set the example by its leadership." Much had been done, but it was possible immediately to secure a tremendous increase—

> by the mobilisation of the workers and technicians in industry, supported by the general public, to break down present restrictions and secure more effective forms of State control . . . and more efficient methods of management and organisation.

The Party's Production Memorandum still holds the field as a serious and practical set of proposals. Development of joint production committees; legalisation of shop stewards; above all, the revival of local trade union organisation, in which interest has dangerously flagged—these are essential lines of advance. At this stage the most vital industries are shipbuilding and repairing and coal. This last the Government should tackle by immediately establishing State control as proposed in the M.F.G.B.'s scheme and conceding the demanded improvement in miners' conditions. As for strikes, no matter what the provocation we have to find the ways and means of settling grievances without stopping production. Con-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tinuity of production to smash Fascism is our unswerving line.

The sharpening of the production issue with the approach of the Second Front needs no emphasis. But there is also the special point that mass offensive in the West will demand millions more men from industry for the armed forces. We Communists, Pollitt observed, can only welcome such a perspective; it means a great political and military strengthening of the army, in which we are proud to play our part, even to laying down our lives. It also raises most urgently the question of a vastly increased intake of women into industry; in this, and especially in doing all possible to train and help women workers, our Party members have the duty to pioneer.

The next point is perhaps of even more general importance. Said Pollitt:—

> The Second Front will not merely intensify existing problems in industry, it will also create new ones. Many new sacrifices will be called for. They will be made willingly, but we demand that there shall be no exceptions. We stand for the ruthless application of equality of sacrifice. We stand for compulsory measures with regard to property as well as in regard to persons.

There should be no hesitation in dealing bluntly and brutally with this question. It is wrong that there should still be so wide a contrast in sacrifice between us and our Allies. But this means real sacrifice all round. "We must put an end to the 'austerity' cant." As for interests which sabotage rationing schemes, as the Tory 1922 Committee did over fuel, leading to dangerous inroads into our precious stocks, "we would shoot such people"; the conference instantly burst into prolonged and thunderous applause, in which they most decidedly spoke for many more than themselves.

It is with no sense of underestimation of the other issues presented in the Report—for they are all tied up with the organisation of victory—that I turn to enumerate them in formal order.

First, on *India*. Pollitt regretted Cripps's association with terms which "represented simply the old 'divide and rule' policy of British imperialism," and concluded: "Re-open negotiations at once with the Indian National Congress, recognise the independence of India and the formation of an Indian National Government."

Second, the *Daily Worker*. The conference resolution pointed out that "the lifting of the ban would be a great popular act which would meet with the enthusiastic support of the workers in the war industries and markedly strengthen national unity and the drive to victory." Pollitt scored neatly when he said:—

> If President Roosevelt can release Earl Browder to "promote national unity," then Churchill, who has such an admiration for the President, would be well advised to take a leaf out of his book and lift the *Daily Worker* ban.

Third, *Post-war reconstruction*. "The working class will not be deflected from the supreme task on hand by any fanciful dreaming about the good time that is coming because, more than any other section of the people, they realise that the defeat of Fascism is the decisive factor in determining the character of their future." Referring to speculation as to post-war developments in Europe, Pollitt observed:

> There are many mistaken ideas as to the character of the rising of the peoples which, along with Allied blows, will destroy Hitler, his foul Nazi regime and his quislings. The struggle of the peoples is not on a narrow class basis, but brings together all sections of the people who oppose Fascism and are striving for national liberation and democratic rights. . . . The destruction of Fascism will be carried out by the alliance of the Socialist State and democratic capitalist States, by the alliance of workers, middle class, and anti-Fascist capitalists. To complete this task, this alliance must continue through the difficult period that must follow this world-wide calamity.

* * * *

On the Anglo-Soviet Alliance, which occupied a central place in the Report, I think that in connection with the new advance Pollitt's summary of the four immediate conditions for strengthening the Alliance is well worth setting down:—

(1) Have full confidence in the Soviet Union.

(2) Recognise that the future Soviet frontiers shall be where the Soviet Government defines them.

(3) Stop slanderous speculations about the future policy of the Soviet Union (certain Labour leaders specialised in the "separate peace" bogy; where is that bogy now?).

(4) Open a Second Front in the West, which will create an indestructible comradeship between the British forces and the Red Army.

* * * *

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of the temper of the conference, and therefore of the Party, both the keen reception of the Report and the character of the discussion were eloquent. That the standing orders committee had their simplest job on record testifies to the deep and mighty unity of our Party at this great moment. Just as the richness and breadth of the discussion, in which 58 delegates took part, signalised the lively democracy within our ranks and the enterprise of our leading comrades. One after another workers from famous factories told of production successes, told of the achievements of Party campaigns; we heard of successes in the countryside; we learnt how our Party members took the lead in blitz crises (the story of the Baedeker raid on Bath and how our comrades stepped triumphantly into a very horrible breach is an ironic comment on the National Council of Labour's claim last August that the Communist Party was "unmoved and unaffected" by "the sufferings of the British people under the strain of Nazi raids").

Women were to the fore in the discussion—though in the last great recruitment our Party got only one woman for every three men, a shortcoming to be remedied. Even more urgent is the fact that no fewer than 355 delegates returned themselves as not having received any Party political education. Our comrades need to acquire understanding as much as they need to enter on activity; that is to say, they must be given the opportunity to acquire it, which is the responsibility of the whole Party and especially of the more experienced members.

This conference was more than a landmark in the history of the Communist Party. It was a conference, as I said at the beginning, of the organisers of victory. It showed the readiness of fifty thousand Communists to face the still bigger tasks, the larger responsibilities that subsequent events have brought on to the order of the day.

The 'Daily Worker' and the Intellectual Front

by B. FARRINGTON

LARGE and powerful sections of the public are now calling for the raising of the ban on the *Daily Worker* for the sake of the production front. It is now widely recognised that the one workers' paper has a tremendous role to play in the factories. When we strike in the West to help our Russian allies in the East, we shall need in the factories every ounce of that morale which the workers' daily best knows how to maintain. If we are to do our best in the physical struggle on the field of battle and in the workshops, we need the *Daily Worker*.

In the intellectual struggle for the defeat of Fascism the *Daily Worker* is no less indispensable. It is not only the workers who need the *Daily Worker*; it is the intellectuals. It is not only in the factories it is needed, but in the universities. The writers need it, the Bishops need it, the Members of Parliament need it. For if, in the realm of physical production, the country is at last getting into its stride, in the realm of intellectual production the output is still miserably inadequate. The gross, obvious and palpable fact that, without the U.S.S.R., democracy faces annihilation, has transformed the military alliance into a treaty. During the war, and for twenty years after the war, we are pledged to collaborate closely with the U.S.S.R. in the rebuilding of the world. But how many understand what is implied by that? How many understand that the great new powerful structure of the U.S.S.R. did not grow by chance, but was designed? How many have an inkling of the fact that the constitution of the U.S.S.R. represents a new level in purposeful political activity? Certainly not the editors of most of our bourgeois newspapers, whose main contribution to enlightenment in this field was to preach the identity of Communism and Nazism; who invented, and put into circulation, the theory that something they called by the monstrous title of "Communazism" was the one enemy of democracy. This piece of political

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wisdom, like the rest of their recent world outlook, has been blown sky high by present realities. But the newspaper editors are not alone responsible for these opinions. They have behind them the backing of the writers, of the universities, of the churches. Therein lies the danger. We have learned overnight that we cannot survive without the U.S.S.R. But what the U.S.S.R. really is cannot be learned overnight. Only by dint of hard mental toil in fields to which they are unaccustomed will our intellectuals arrive at this goal. Meanwhile their power to mislead the public, as they have misled them up to now, is enormous. The British public cannot afford to do without the political wisdom, the hard-won, slowly-acquired insight into current affairs, of the staff of the *Daily Worker* and its contributors. It is the patriotic duty of all those who understand the truth of this to fight for the restoration of the *Daily Worker*, to fight for its voice to be heard again in the councils of the nation.

The *Daily Worker* was right about China, right about Abyssinia, right about Spain, right about Munich, right about Finland. What is more, it was right while there was still time. It was right all along about Russia. Banned though it is, it has made its voice heard about the Second Front; and it is right again. We need that voice. If we silence it, to whom shall we look for guidance?

Perhaps you think we might look to the universities. There are, you will say, professors of political philosophy who will keep us straight. Listen to one of them, an eminent and influential political philosopher paid to instruct and guide our youth. This is Professor F. C. J. Hearnshaw speaking :—

> The Russian revolution was in effect little more than an orgy of plunder carried through in a leisurely and systematic manner, with merciless completeness and cynical disregard of all ethical principles, under a dictatorship of the criminal classes. Its Communism was simply a screen of Marxian verbiage which barely veiled the naked hideousness of predatory individualism—the perverted and anti-social individualism of the burglar and the assassin.
>
> The Communism of Marxian socialists is nothing else than the massed individualisms of a horde of primitive cave-men, or of a pack of hungry wolves. It is not the next step in a progressive evolution; it is a reversion to a prehistoric stage of barbarism and savagery.

If you want more of that kind of thing you will find it in the distinguished author's "Socialism : Analytical, Historical and Critical." And not until you understand what eminent professors of politics can do in the way of historical analysis and criticism is it fully possible to understand the blindness of the statesmen they trained, the men responsible for the policies which lost us the peace, the men who guided us in the years which we now call "the years which the locusts have eaten." But perhaps you think Hearnshaw an exception, a crusted old Tory with a licence to rant instead of reason. Listen again. Let us hear the voice of a Liberal, the voice of the Minister for Education under a Labour Government, the voice of the famous historian, H. A. L. Fisher. A few years before the war Fisher produced a one-volume history of Europe which was generally hailed by the recognised authorities in the English-speaking world as a masterpiece. It was also a best-seller. It continues to sell well. It has been republished since the war. It is still the most authoritative pronouncement on the meaning of European history given out by an English bourgeois historian.

How did Fisher's grip on European history help him to guide the feet of our statesmen and publicists? Listen to him :

> The Hitler revolution is a sufficient guarantee that Russian Communism will not spread westward. The solid German bourgeois holds the central fortress of Europe. But there may be secrets in Fascism or Hitlerism which the democracies of the West will desire, without abandoning their fundamental character, to adopt.

That book still sells in every bookshop, stands on the shelves of every public library, has its corner in the workshop of every journalist who directs public opinion. And there is not an opinion in it on the development of European civilization which is not all of one piece with this perilous judgment on contemporary affairs. Are the policies of the men of Munich hatched only by the brains of Birmingham ironmasters? Alas, no! The Liberal historian is there to insinuate the same line of action. It is only a few years since he was telling us to feel comfortable because the solid German bourgeois held the central fortress of Europe. That did not help us to save Czecho-Slovakia. Now we muster a thousand

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bombers in a night to try to weaken the grip of the solid German bourgeois on a bit of that central fortress. The learned Fisher looked to Hitler to save us from Stalin when the workers' daily was warning us that, in the end, we would have to look to Stalin to save us from Hitler. Who was right? We need that wisdom. We need it in the universities.

And in the churches. Here is the Bishop of Chichester, writing after the war had begun, writing in 1940. For him, in his Penguin Special, "Christianity and World Order," "Communazism" is still the enemy. He makes no distinction between the Fascist States and Russia. Of both he says, "They are the destroyers of civilization." Or again, "What immense and terrible pains have been expended on the misdirection and distorted education of the Hitler youth, and the Fascist youth in Italy, and the Communist youth in Russia!" In his blind prejudice the Bishop draws no distinction between Hitler's forcing of the educated youth of Germany back into the brutal superstitions of "Mein Kampf" and the modern scientific education which Russia is giving for the first time to its sixth of the world. The consequence for the Bishop is that, within a few months, his patriotism compels him to accept one of his "destroyers" as the saviour of civilization. But the world does not get off so lightly. Blood is shed and terrible sufferings and shames endured because Bishops and others in high places have not troubled to think.

And here is Sidney Dark, a lay churchman, late editor of the *Church Times*. In certain directions his conscience is awake. So impressed is he by the Church's neglect of the social problem that, in his recent book, "The Church: Impotent or Triumphant?" he voices his conviction that the Church must either come down on the side of Socialism or disappear. But, soaked as he is in the prejudices of his Church, it has not occurred to him that before he attacks Marxism he should find out what it is. Like any Bishop he assures us that :—

> Socialism (the context makes it clear that he means Marxism) has failed because it accepts the capitalist theory that all human motives are "conscious or unconscious derivatives from the economic motive." That was certainly not true of the socialist pioneers of the last century. It was not true of Keir Hardie and the founders of the British Labour Party. It was, however, true of Marx. . . . It was true of Lenin, and explains why Bolshevism has degenerated into a bureaucratic tyranny.

Do we not need the *Daily Worker* to fight this intellectual darkness? Who first produced this hairy old slander that Marxism is a brand of psychology, and that it is distinguished from other brands by its purblind concentration on selfishness? One cannot call this a misinterpretation of Marxism. It has simply nothing to do with Marxism at all, which is not a psychological theory but an objective interpretation of the development of human society. Nevertheless, such is the level of indifference and ignorance to which contemporary British thought has sunk that men of greater fame than Sidney Dark, men of the level of Bertrand Russell for instance, write large books refuting this puerile psychology under the impression that they are refuting Marx.

These are just a handful of examples, culled at random from the current literature of the day, which indicate what a task there is for the *Daily Worker* to perform on the intellectual front when we get it back. Intellectuals and workers, let us fight side by side for our paper. A new fellowship between workers and intellectuals will be one of the features of the new Britain we are determined to build. The *Daily Worker* will strengthen that fellowship and give it a voice. Let us not rest till we have forced the lifting of the ban, the ban that stands between us and our joint service of the community.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in the LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: 12 months 7s., 6 months 3s. 6d. Postage paid.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain in the World Front

by HARRY POLLITT

IT is impossible to read this new important book by R. Palme Dutt without one's mind going back to the comprehensive analysis he made many years ago of the whole processes and dangers contained in the emergence of Fascism, in his well-known work, "Fascism and Social Revolution." Here, in the present book, we have brought together for the first time, not only what is at stake, but what has to be done if Britain is to play its real part in the world front now arrayed against the Axis Powers. This book is not only extremely important because it again gives the basic analysis of what Fascism is, represents and aims to achieve, but also the concrete lead that needs to be operated if this vilest menace of all time is to be wiped off the face of the earth.

It is, in fact, a book that contains within its pages a complete guide to victory—but not only that. For if the policy it puts forward is operated it not only guarantees that victory, but—something equally important—it will have already laid the basis for the immediate operation of so many of those things that will help to produce a better form of society in Britain than exists at present. This aspect is not something that is divorced in a water-tight compartment; it is a vital part of any serious aim at winning the war, and winning the peace that the victory will bring.

Written on the background of the entire international situation that exists at this moment—with, of course, most attention to the position of Britain in the struggle—it goes on to give the clearest analysis of what Fascism is—not from any single standpoint, but from everything that is associated with the struggle for social advance, and the real role that Fascism is intended to play in this present epoch.

The result is that from this new understanding of the basic forces behind Fascism, and what its aims are, the reader at once sees clearly that its destruction is the most urgent task that ever confronted democratic peoples who desire to see the world purged of a menace that threatens every gain of the centuries that have gone by. This is done in such a way as to serve a double purpose: it not only reveals the real reactionary class forces behind Fascism, and shows why these are supported by similar reactionary forces in Britain, but makes clear the distinction between the Fascists and the mass of the people in the Fascist countries. It is a distinction that is especially important at this moment when the Vansittart school of thought is so active, when certain labour leaders also become the mediums through which it endeavours to penetrate the labour movement, and when natural indignation is roused by the appalling atrocities that the Nazis have committed in the Soviet Union, as well as in the other occupied countries of Europe.

But the importance of the book is not only because this is done with all Dutt's usual brilliance and clarity of thought, but that arising out of it there come the subsequent chapters of the book which give the concrete lead on all the particular problems that we are confronted with in Britain at the present time. There is in fact unfolded for the serious attention of the reader the most comprehensive analysis of the existing position in regard to Production, Agriculture, Women and War, the Armed Forces and other burning issues arising from the Home Front that has yet been brought to light. Not only so, but in each case there is the most systematic examination of what can be done, and how it can be done, that has yet been developed in any document since the outbreak of the war.

It is impossible in the course of a short review to give the reader any adequate idea of the ground that is covered in each of these sections. Let it suffice to try and give this impression: If the worker in industry wants to know what he or she can do, they will find it here. If the worker on field or farm wants to know what practical things they can press forward on the War Agricultural Committees, local and county councils, they will find it here. If men and women alike feel they would like to play a greater role in helping to utilise to the fullest advantages women labour in every sector of the war front, they will find the best way to do so outlined in this book.

PRODUCED 2005 BY OSZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If the men and women in the armed forces feel that something is lacking so far as their work and treatment are concerned, and they are looking round for a lead as to what can be done, here it is.

There is nothing suggested that is not backed up by a wealth of facts, arguments and examples, that make it the most constructive document that has yet been published. Here are the facts, then the lead, and following from this, what needs to be done to operate what is suggested. It is a book that we have no hesitation in describing as a Handbook to Victory. It will be eagerly read and studied by all thoughtful people in this country. But it will have even more important results—it is bound to develop the will to see that what is suggested must be carried out.

The last section of the book deals with the Labour Movement and the War. Never was such a section as this so timely. At this moment when all sorts of one-sided pictures are being presented as to the situation in the labour movement, and as a result of this all sorts of short cuts are being suggested, and certain panic-stricken doctrines being preached in the belief that the more high-sounding the phrases used, the quicker will the ills of the labour movement be cured, we see how accurately Dutt places the position in its correct perspective. It is not the weakness of the labour movement that Dutt concentrates upon, but its strength, and its greater strength once there were unity inside the labour movement, and the splendid possibilities for all-round advance that would be opened up as a result of such unity.

This theme is directly related to the whole of the problems associated with the building up of national unity in Britain. This is not treated as some catch phrase, but as the indispensable pre-requisite for any serious talk of achieving the victory over Fascism, and from this it is shown and proved how the very development of unbreakable national unity presupposes more mass activity than ever before by the labour movement. It is shown that coalition with other parties in the struggle against Fascism does not result in a weakening of the labour movement, but on the contrary the more energetically the labour movement plays its own independent role, advances and popularises its own distinctive policy within the framework of national unity, the stronger it becomes and the more decisive part it plays in the winning of the war, and in a new conception of the future on the part of millions of previously inactive people who are now being attracted to politics for the first time.

Such a treatment as this is not only timely in view of what we have seen take place in recent elections and at the Labour Party Conference, it helps give the positive picture, that when read will immediately result in a dissipation of the sense of frustration and "leftism" which together are at present helping hold back the full forces of the labour movement being brought to bear. It is not a few leaders pursuing a policy of their own in splendid isolation that Dutt in this section is concerned to deal with, but the inexhaustible resources and possibilities that are possessed by the masses who are organised in the Labour Movement. It is the faith in the working class, confidence in what it can and will do once the political conviction is reached, both in regard to the urgency of the present situation and the tasks that have to be fulfilled.

I strongly recommend this book to the attention of all who want to play *their* part. Here we see the perfect combination of theory and practice in the most important book that has been published since the war broke out; one that needs to secure the widest possible circulation, to become the subject of special study circles and discussion classes not in general terms, but in order that in a particular industry or section of the war front, its lead can be applied in the concrete circumstances that exist in each case. Especially in the factories, trade unions, local labour parties, and co-operative guilds should it be well circulated, for once its significance is understood here, there can never again be a repetition of the last Labour Party Conference. It can already be preparing the way to make the coming Trades Union Congress of quite a new kind, one whose discussions and decisions will be seen to have an immediate meaning for all the organised workers, and not become paper resolutions of a small section of the trade union bureaucracy.

"Britain in the World Front" will become the guide to victory. The only

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other thing that I would say in regard to this is to press home as strongly as possible the urgency of the situation. The recent new Treaty signed between Britain and the Soviet Union marks one of the most important political landmarks in the history of this country as well as in our relations with the Soviet Union. But it also places on every one of us entirely new responsibilities, for the Second Front will make demands of a new kind so far as sacrifice is concerned. It is not only a question of sacrifice for the people in uniform, but for the whole people. This is why this book takes on an added importance. For if its policy is carried out, then not only will the creation of a Second Front be hastened, but everything that will be required to maintain it readily produced and the whole spirit of self-sacrifice enormously increased, and in this way victory this year assured.

Document of the Month

Treaty

of Alliance in the War Against Hitlerite Germany and her Associates in Europe and of Collaboration and Mutual Assistance Thereafter Concluded Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

HIS MAJESTY The King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, and the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

Desiring to confirm the stipulations of the Agreement between His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for joint action in the war against Germany, signed at Moscow on the 12th July, 1941, and to replace them by a formal treaty;

Desiring to contribute after the war to the maintenance of peace and to the prevention of further aggression by Germany or the States associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe;

Desiring, moreover, to give expression to their intention to collaborate closely with one another as well as with the other United Nations at the peace settlement and during the ensuing period of reconstruction on the basis of the principles enunciated in the declaration made on the 14th August, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of Great Britain to which the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has adhered;

Desiring, finally, to provide for mutual assistance in the event of an attack upon either High Contracting Party by Germany or any of the States associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe.

Have decided to conclude a treaty for that purpose and have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:—

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India,

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

The Right Honourable Anthony Eden, M.P., His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs;

The Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

M. Vyacheslav Mikhailovich Molotov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs,

Who, having communicated their Full Powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:—

PART I

ARTICLE I

In virtue of the alliance established between the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the High Contracting Parties mutually undertake to afford one another military and other assistance and support of all kinds in the war against Germany and all those States which are associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe.

ARTICLE II

The High Contracting Parties undertake not to enter into any negotiations with the Hitlerite Government or any other Government in Germany that does not clearly renounce all aggressive intentions, and not to negotiate or conclude except by mutual consent any armistice or peace treaty with Germany or any other State associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe.

PART II

ARTICLE III

(1) The High Contracting Parties declare their desire to unite with other like-minded States in adopting proposals for common action to preserve peace and resist aggression in the post-war period.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(2) Pending the adoption of such proposals, they will after the termination of hostilities take all the measures in their power to render impossible a repetition of aggression and violation of the peace by Germany or any of the States associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe.

ARTICLE IV

Should one of the High Contracting Parties during the post-war period become involved in hostilities with Germany or any of the States mentioned in Article III (2) in consequence of an attack by that State against that Party, the other High Contracting Party will at once give to the Contracting Party so involved in hostilities all the military and other support and assistance in his power.

This Article shall remain in force until the High Contracting Parties, by mutual agreement, shall recognise that it is superseded by the adoption of the proposals contemplated in Article III (1). In default of the adoption of such proposals, it shall remain in force for a period of twenty years, and thereafter until terminated by either High Contracting Party, as provided in Article VIII.

ARTICLE V

The High Contracting Parties, having regard to the interests of the security of each of them, agree to work together in close and friendly collaboration after the re-establishment of peace for the organisation of security and economic prosperity in Europe. They will take into account the interests of the United Nations in these objects, and they will act in accordance with the two principles of not seeking territorial aggrandisement for themselves and of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States.

ARTICLE VI

The High Contracting Parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war.

ARTICLE VII

Each High Contracting Party undertakes not to conclude any alliance and not to take any part in any coalition directed against the other High Contracting Party.

ARTICLE VIII

The present Treaty is subject to ratification in the shortest possible time and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged in Moscow as soon as possible.

It comes into force immediately on the exchange of the instruments of ratification and shall thereupon replace the Agreement between the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, signed at Moscow on the 12th July, 1941.

Part I of the present Treaty shall remain in force until the re-establishment of peace between the High Contracting Parties and Germany and the Powers associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe.

Part II of the present Treaty shall remain in force for a period of twenty years. Thereafter, unless twelve months' notice has been given by either Party to terminate the Treaty at the end of the said period of twenty years, it shall continue in force until twelve months after either High Contracting Party shall have given notice to the other in writing of his intention to terminate it.

In witness whereof the above-named Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done in duplicate in London on the 26th day of May, 1942, in the English and Russian languages, both texts being equally authentic.

(L.S.) ANTHONY EDEN.

(L.S.) V. MOLOTOV.

London, May 26, 1942.

A statement issued by the Foreign Office on June 11 said :—

The two Governments are confident that this treaty will form a solid basis for future good relations between their countries and will further strengthen the already close and cordial understanding existing between the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, as well as between them and the United States of America, which were kept informed of the course of the conversations and of the signature of the treaty. Both parties are also confident that the treaty will be a new powerful weapon in the struggle against Hitlerite Germany and her associates in Europe until complete victory is won, and that it will ensure close collaboration between both countries after the victorious end of the war.

Full understanding was reached between the two parties with regard to the urgent tasks of creating a Second Front in Europe in 1942. Mr. Molotov, Mr. Maisky, Major-General Issayev and Rear-Admiral Kharlamov, and Mr. Churchill, Mr. Attlee, Mr. Eden and the British Chiefs of Staff took part in the conversations on this subject. Discussions also took place on the question of further improving the supplies of aeroplanes, tanks and other war material to be sent from Great Britain to the Soviet Union. Both sides were gratified to note the identity of their views on all the above questions.

Book Reviews

India Our Ally?

India Our Ally? by D. N. Pritt, K.C., M.P. (Frederick Muller, Ltd., 1s net).

MR. PRITT HAD the pertinacity of instinct to anticipate the difficulties inherent in the British Government's Declaration which Sir Stafford Cripps took to India. Hence the question mark after the title of his pamphlet, and hence his decision to issue it in spite of the fact that it was mainly an exposition of the history of the Indo-British relationship of the last few years. And since, without wishing the Cripps mission ill or embarrassing it by any indelicacy, Mr. Pritt forecast the pitfalls on which the mission would

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

flounder, his pamphlet remains valid in its main assumptions and ought to be widely read.

First of all, he points out, what spokesmen and publicists on behalf of the Government have throughout tried to conceal, the omission in the Declaration of any proposal to establish immediately a provisional national government in India, and the absence in the Cripps despatch case of any formula for giving the Indian leaders immediate responsibility, so that they could mobilise their people effectively for the prosecution of the war against Fascism. In this prognostication Mr. Pritt had laid his finger on the one issue which loomed so largely on the horizon during the talks. How could the Indian leaders ignore the problem of the immediate defence of India and the question of necessary power to enable them to mobilise this defence? Conscious of the role of India in the world struggle against Fascism, and with the experience of the debacles in Malaya, Dutch East Indies and Burma, where the native populations, oppressed by white imperialism, remained indifferent to, or even aided and abetted, the new aggressor, they were, after all, asking for the minimum basis for an agreement—the right to go and call their people to arms, to enthuse them in the name of a responsible national government representing the people and sympathetic to the aspirations of the peasants and workers, to fight against the new ruthless Japanese imperialism. Mr. Pritt refers to the Philippinos and calls attention to the fact that a legislature composed of the nationals of the Philippines, under their own President, with a definite recognition of their right to freedom, put up a long and gallant defence of their country for these very reasons. Is there anyone still so blinded by prejudice, then, that he cannot see how an Indian national government alone, with an Indian Defence Minister, could save India? It is no use merely empowering an Indian Defence Minister, as the White Paper does, with the responsibility to run canteens and the Stationery Office, etc., when the unconventional infiltration tactics, with which the Fascist aggressors are fighting, urge the recruitment of a people's militia and guerrilla fighters to help the million or so comparatively ill-equipped British-Indian soldiers of the regular army to defend India. When Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek almost strained diplomatic privilege by asking Britain to give "great political power" to India, he had the realities of the eastern theatre of war in mind.

It would be invidious to compare the forensic abilities of two such eminent lawyers as Pritt and Sir Stafford Cripps. And yet the defects in that part of the Declaration which dealt with the future constitution of India seem to have disclosed themselves to the former at a glance, while the latter (also a *Socialist!*) carried the self-same Declaration as a missionary and gave his full backing to it. Surely Sir Stafford must have seen, what Mr. Pritt sees, that apart altogether from being a speculative scheme for the future, it nullifies the very freedom it offers by imposing a reactionary manner for the creation of that freedom. The Electoral College which is to frame the new constitution is to consist of all the members of the provincial legislatures elected under the 1935 India Act, plus representatives of the Indian States. If it is remembered that only about 13 per cent. of the people of India have the vote, and that there is also separate communal representation, democracy would not seem to have much of a chance to trickle through. Besides, the despotic princes would nominate their representatives. The Electoral College would, therefore, hardly represent the popular will. Under these circumstances the separatists would have an ideal chance to split India up by choosing to remain outside the union, a right deliberately vouchsafed to them in order to ensure *divide et impera*.

But this is no time to discuss the future Dominion Constitution for India. The world struggle has entered a decisive stage and India has actually become the scene of battle. What is to be done? That is the immediate question. How are the Indian people to be assured the power to act?

One of Mr. Pritt's great qualities is that he can confirm the familiar feelings of his audience. In his pamphlet he answers just the kind of questions which English people generally ask about India. With their background brought up to date by this brochure, readers will be able to dispose of the slanders of the gutter press on India and address themselves to the task of winning that country over to the alliance and help it to defend itself.

MULK RAJ ANAND.

BOUND VOLUMES, 1942

Will all readers who contemplate ordering a bound volume for the current year PLEASE be very careful to keep their complete set of twelve copies clean and in good condition to be returned to us at the end of the year. Copies from June to December inclusive will be quite indispensable, and a bound copy can only be supplied on these terms.

Do NOT send any copies to our office until you see a notice asking for them.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY DEVELOPMENT FUND

Amount collected during June, 1942 : £53 : 11 : 11

MORE IN SORROW . . .

. . than in anger we announce the low total which our Birthday Presents have reached at the moment of going to press—June 12. A few Discussion Groups have written us that they have held socials and sent us the very creditable proceedings. Too few, though. And members of the Forces continue to set the best examples: "From a few of the boys in khaki and converts, somewhere in England." Red Gunner, sending us a *whole week's* pay, says: "I have noticed that members of the Royal Artillery seem to be quite high up in contributing to the D. F. (though the Navy does quite well). Now, what about some of the other arms of the Forces? Can't, for instance, some out of the other Forces (the R.A.O.C. or the R.E.) spare a day's pay occasionally to help the most inspiring monthly we have?"

"May the LABOUR MONTHLY's 21st Birthday be so successful that the postman will have to bring donations to the fund by the sackful!" This is the fervent wish of one ardent supporter, heartily echoed by the LABOUR MONTHLY staff (if not by the postman!), and though they will be too late for inclusion in the July total, they can never be too late to put to good use.

As the above was written the postman called, with half a guinea from more R.A.'s

	£	s.	d.
Maidstone D.G.		4	0
Winchmore Hill D.G.		7	2
Goring D.G.		5	0
L. H., Midlothian		13	0
5 Red Artillerymen		7	2
R. R., N.W.11		10	0
P. Jordan			7
Amersham D.G.		2	10
A. McGeachan		5	0
Anon., Cardiff		13	0
S. Skeep		1	6
G. Power		3	0
L. M. Stevens		1	6
F. L. Franklyn		1	6
W. A. Burbridge		1	6
C. Bragg		7	0
L. A. Leeds		5	0
W. Rickard		4	0
Pinner D.G.		4	0
R. Barnes		7	0
J. Petrie		2	6
J. B., Chelmsford		5	0
J. McLean		3	6
G. W. S. Robinson		16	0
M. G. J.		1	6
J. Tigg		3	0
Clifton D.G.		5	0
A. Maclaren		3	0
A. Wall		5	0
M. Christopher		2	6
B. H. Steel		1	9
A. McMillan		4	0
H. Hodson		6	6
Anon., Burnham-on-Sea		5	0
Birkenhead D.G.		5	0
R. Farrell		13	0
Jane		10	0
H. D. Corbishley		1	6
Muriel & Elizabeth		5	0
E. Pearl		14	0
J. W. Storey		3	0
Acton D.G.		2	6
C. Nunn		10	0
O. I. P. Rees		10	0
R. T. Jourdain		16	6
W. S. Lee		3	0
R. N. Millar		5	0
W. F. Lakin-Smith		2	0
N. Kelly		5	0

	£	s.	d.
Penrith D.G.		10	0
J. P. Ellis		1	6
M. M. Richardson		3	0
G. J. Howson		1	0
R. V. Hill		3	0
H. W. Hall			6
C. Robson		5	0
F. R. Dyke		3	0
Anon., Rickmansworth		8	0
R. J. Mecredy		13	0
H. H. Harrison		3	6
E. Laban		2	6
L. Herbert		13	0
B. Brain		3	0
Keynsham C.P.		5	0
T. Murray		5	0
H. H. Steen		1	6
F. H. Seymour		3	6
Goring D.G.		7	0
J. Austin		13	0
Addington D.G.	1	1	0
Red Gunner	1	2	9
A. & B. Muskett	1	0	0
Hampstead D.G.		7	8
Norwich D.G.		6	0
W. Whitworth		10	0
P. S.		5	0
Harpenden D.G.		15	0
H. W. Carver		5	0
P. Jordan		2	6
F. M. Roy		13	0
D. R. Morgan		13	0
M. Macfarlane		3	0
D. W. S. Daniels		1	6
E. W. Brockman		3	0
E. T. Wargent		3	0
E. P. Ryan		3	6
Enfield D.G.		15	0
Radlett D.G.		8	0
Les Bates		2	0
Hornchurch D.G.		10	0
J. W. Porter		10	0
Y. Thompson		3	6
D. Bassett		3	6
Mrs. W. Geber		2	6
M. Christopher		2	6
S. G. Nowell		1	6
A. N. Silver		13	0
Holborn D.G.		5	0

	£	s.	d.
Edinburgh D.G.		13	0
Edgware D.G.	2	0	0
Socialist Sailor	2	10	0
R. R., N.W.3	1	0	0
D. H. Blackford		3	6
W. Daff		7	0
T. Moncrieff		1	0
G. M. Grant		5	0
A. R. M.		10	0
Q. Z.		4	0
A. Nicholls		3	0
Gruzya Uchitiellya		15	0
Edmonton D.G.		3	6
E. D. McCallum		10	0
P. Horton		16	6
A. J. Wilkin			6
P. Cogan		2	6
R. F. B.	2	0	0
R. Frost		3	0
A. J. Rees		13	0
Welwyn D.G.		2	6
Bankhead D.G.		5	0
Orpington D.G.		2	0
Harringay D.G.		2	0
P. Ibbotson		3	0
A. E. Colbron		3	0
E. Yeo		2	6
G. Philibert		10	0
L'Humanite		2	0
N. & E. Lipton		5	0
E. C. Still		3	0
Bevano		13	3
A. L. Jones		5	0
Red Infantryman		10	0
Hampstead D.G.		5	8
B. Duffy		2	6
Beaumaris D.G.		2	3
Grantham D.G.	1	0	0
Birkenhead D.G.		3	6
A. J. Crockett		5	0
G. Ramsay		6	6
H. S. M.		2	6
K. C. Jacobs	1	13	0
Forest Gate D.G.		4	4
Jane		10	0
C. Tarling		10	0
Anon., Whitchurch		1	0
6 Red Artillerymen		10	6
Rene, Lowestoft		1	6

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BRITAIN
IN
THE WORLD FRONT

by

R. Palme Dutt

Messrs. Lawrence & Wishart announce the publication on July 8th of a Library Edition of R. Palme Dutt's new book, which will then be available to the general public.

The great importance of this book lies in its clear presentation of the pressing needs of the present hour, and of the practical tasks which must be fulfilled if the full strength of Britain is to be exerted in the supreme battle which is now being fought for the future of mankind.

5/-

LAWRENCE & WISHART

2, Southampton Place, W.C.1

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Evans Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4.

H B

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED